THE Lutheran Quarterly

olume VIII FEBRUARY, 1956 Number 1

PACIFIC LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY THE LIBRARY

V.8
1956

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Managing Editor
A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

Book Editor
WARREN A. QUANBECK
2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

Circulation Manager
PAUL M. LINDBERG
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.

AUGSBURG SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEB.

CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA
WATERLOO, ONT.

GRANDVIEW SEMINARY
DES MOINES, IOWA

HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

LUTHERAN SEMINARY
SASKATOON, SASK.

NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
COLUMBIA, S. C.

SUOMI SEMINARY
HANCOCK, MICH.

TRINITY SEMINARY
BLAIR, NEB.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN SEMINARY
BERKELEY, CALIF.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume VIII FEBRUARY, 1956 Number 1

CONTENTS

THE OFFICE OF OVERSEER IN THE CHURCH ..... *Richard R. Caemmerer* 3

IS THE COEXISTENCE OF THE OLD AND NEW MAN BIBLICAL? *Roy A. Harrisville* 20

PROFESSIONALISM AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH ..... *Herbert Stroup* 33

JUSTIFICATION AND THE DISCIPLINE OF LITURGICS ..... *William Nagel* 43

WILLIAM FREDERICK LEHMANN ..... *Paul H. Buehring* 51

"FOR YOU" AND "FOR MANY" ..... *Olof H. Nelson* 61

LIFE AND THOUGHT IN WORLD LUTHERANISM

Denmark: The Folk Church in Denmark ..... *Johannes Knudsen* 69

CORRESPONDENCE AND COMMENT

A Rebuttal on India ..... *Robert Paul Roth* 74
Ideology Versus Religion—No Tactical Blunders ..... *Ernest B. Koenker* 75

BOOK REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES

Napier, *From Faith to Faith* (Ethan Mengers) 79
Leslie, *Jeremiah* (John V. Halverson) 80
Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (Robert H. Boyd) 81
Parrot, *Discovering Buried Worlds* (Wendell W. Frerichs) 82
Grant, *The Sword and the Cross* (Raymond T. Stamm) 83
Easton, *Early Christianity* (Raymond T. Stamm) 85
Holmquist, *Handbok I Svensk Kyrokohistoria II, III* (Conrad Bergendoff) 86
Lueker, *Lutheran Cyclopedia* (W. D. Allbeck) 86
Horton, *Christian Theology* (John H. Sardeson) 88
Josefson, *Bibelns Auktoritet* (E. H. Wahlstrom) 89
Hillerdal, *Gehorsam gegen Gott und Menschen* (Walter T. Tillmanns) 90
Kimpel, *Faith and Moral Authority* (A. C. M. Ahlén) 91
Birkeli, *Politikk og Misjon* (A. S. Burgess) 92
Myklebust, *The Study of Missions in Theological Education, I* (T. G. Tappert) 93
Chan, *Religious Trends in Modern China* (E. H. Wahlstrom) 94
Nida, *Customs and Cultures* (John E. Gronli) 95
Reichelt, *Meditation and Piety in the Far East* (John E. Gronli) 95
Corson, *The Christian Imprint* (Ralph D. Heim) 96
Bonderud & Lutz, *America's Lutherans* 96

CONTRIBUTORS

Richard R. Caemmerer is professor of Homiletics in the Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri.

Roy A. Harrisville is pastor of Trinity Church (E.L.C.), Mason City, Iowa.

Herbert Stroup is dean of students and professor of Sociology in Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York.

William Nagel is a Lutheran pastor in Greifswald, Germany. His article was translated from German by John W. Doberstein, professor of Pastoral Theology in the Philadelphia Seminary.

Paul H. Buehring is professor emeritus of the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary, Columbus, Ohio.

Olof H. Nelson is a retired minister of the Augustana Lutheran Church who is now residing in Chicago.

Reporter on "Life and Thought in World Lutheranism" in this issue is Johannes Knudsen, professor of Church History in the Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Maywood, Illinois.

Contributors to "Correspondence and Comment" are Robert Paul Roth, professor of the New Testament in the Lutheran Southern Seminary, Columbia, South Carolina, and Ernest B. Koenker, instructor of History and Religion in Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Indiana.

Among the reviewers in this issue are A. C. M. Ahlén, professor of Philosophy in Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary; W. D. Allbeck, professor of Church History in the Hamma Divinity School; Conrad Bergendoff, president of Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois; Robert H. Boyd, professor of the Old Testament in Luther Theological Seminary; Andrew S. Burgess, professor of Missions in Luther Theological Seminary; Wendell W. Frerichs, pastor of Trinity Church (E.L.C.), Stevens Point, Wisconsin; John E. Gronli, instructor in the Lutheran Bible Institute, Minneapolis, Minnesota; John V. Halvorson, professor of the Old Testament in Luther Theological Seminary; Ralph D. Heim, professor of Christian Education in the Gettysburg Seminary; Ethan Mengers, professor of the Old Testament in Trinity Seminary, Blair, Nebraska; John H. Sardeson, pastor to Lutheran students in Cornell University; Raymond T. Stamm, professor of the New Testament in the Gettysburg Seminary; Walter G. Tillmanns, professor of Modern Languages in Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa; Eric H. Wahlstrom, professor of the New Testament in Augustana Theological Seminary.

19360

The Office of Overseer in the Church

By Richard R. Caemmerer

THE TOPIC interests us for several reasons. The one is the ecumenical movement. Traditionally this effort has confronted two sets of hurdles: those in the domain of faith and those in the domain of order. Ours is a great time for theological discussion, and some progress seems in the making at least in the domain of faith. To this Lutheran theologians, both European and American, have made their contributions. The hurdles in the domain of order remain more stubborn. Contributory to this has been the assumption on the part of much of Protestantism that order is separate from faith and that human arrangements rather than revealed doctrine are basic to it. Can Lutherans themselves see eye to eye on the questions of order, the nature of the ministry of the church and its call? Can the formula for ecumenical progress be applied here also: first take seriously the position of your own denomination?[1]

The other source of interest for this topic is the practical concern of all of us for the training of the Lutheran ministry. Whether our disciplines are theoretical or practical, whether our tasks are academic or administrative, we have been charged by our churches with the training of their ministers. This requires a continual refreshing of point of view and clarifying of vision. The academic specialist, by virtue of his training and experience, stands at but one post of the assembly line. His product, however, demands much more of him than the wielder of wrench or electric drill in Detroit. It is the nature of the theological disciplines that all contribute to the basic equipment of the Christian minister. The better the professor envisions his product, the more effective his contribution to the total end-result.

The doctrines of church and ministry have been a perennial focus of concern of Lutherans. The Lutheran Reformation itself can be summarized as a reinterpretation of the royal priesthood of all believers

1 Oliver S. Tomkins, *The Church in the Purpose of God* (New York: World Council of Churches, n.d.), 45.

and a repudiation of the secular function of bishops. The Lutheran Confessions still remain a primary source book for formulating the principles of church and ministry. Nevertheless, right within Lutheran groups, and especially in America, differences have prevailed. Hence a discussion of this topic provides new exercise in the ever important skills of understanding and applying Bible and Confessions. The New Testament furnishes its contributions in several ways. There are the basic descriptions of the church, its people in action, and its servants. There are additional assertions on doctrines and teachings, such as the kingdom of God, which appear to be correlated in terms of the reader's own understanding of the subject. There are, finally, descriptions of events in the apostolic church which some find to be in support of basic differences. Obviously room for dispute and coloration through a previously fixed concept of church and ministry are especially possible in the use of the second and third class.

Behind the entire problem lies the historical situation, the source and matrix of the differences of opinion and resulting contrasts in structure. Even a superficial glance reveals the process beginning in the Apostolic Age and repeating itself from time to time through the centuries. The church begins as an assembly of Christians bound to their Lord and to one another, determined to evangelize their world and to edify one another. The more rapidly the church grows, however, the more necessary becomes the supervision of its teaching, the management of its properties and charities, the safeguards against sham and heresy, and the direction of the church's professional forces. Thus, again and again, the visible and structural overwhelms the invisible; the authority of rule and rank disputes the authority of Christ and of task. The Old Catholic Church, the early Middle Ages, the sects of the late Middle Ages, the Reformation era in various combinations and permutations, the reaction of free churches and evangelistic movements against state churches, the battle for clarity on American soil, and now the lines drawn through the ecumenical conversation, reveal this dialectic of history. We mention it here because it colors our understanding of the New Testament. It makes us very humble as we go to it and to whatever light our spiritual fathers possessed for the answers that we ourselves need in the simple exercise of our own office.

I. The Church of Christ and Its Servants

In the New Testament the term "church," *ecclesia,* is in itself a figure of speech. The language of the day used the term to describe the town meeting of citizens. The Septuagint had employed it in translating the gathering of Israel for worship. Two points of comparison seem to have existed side by side in the thinking of Christians: that the members of the church were together because of a calling (note Eph. 4:1 in sequence with 3:21); and the close union in which the members of the church stand to one another. Both of these concepts are apparent already in the sayings of Jesus (Matt. 18:17-20), and are reinforced by St. Paul in the phrase "body of Christ," his most explicit synonym for church (possibly prefigured by Jesus in Matt. 25:40). The life of the body stems, in each of its members and in the body as a whole, from Jesus Christ (note Eph. 1:18-23; 3:16-21). This life is the responsibility, however, of each member of the church to communicate to each other one. The New Testament develops a general into a technical term in order to describe this active relation of Christians to one another in the body of Christ, namely *koinonia,* usually translated "fellowship." In terms explicit of the church this concept is developed I Cor. 10-15; Rom. 12-15; Eph. 4-6. Without the explicit reference to "church" the same process is discussed in the sayings of Jesus, particularly John 13-17; and by St. John in I John. St. Paul coins the concept of "edification" in order to point up this mutual function (Eph. 2:22; 4:12; etc.).

Spiritual life is engendered in each Christian by God through the redeeming work of Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit, who actually *is* that life, is uniquely the result of that same redeeming work (cf. John 16:7; II Cor. 3). Hence the great means by which Christians produce and sustain this life in one another is that they hold this redeeming work of Christ before one another, that they "speak the Word of Christ"; note particularly Col. 3:12-16:

> Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. And above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness. And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body; and be ye thankful. Let the word of Christ

dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.

This passage suggests one of the prime methods by which the members of the church edify one another through the Word of Christ, namely their common worship (note also Eph. 5:15-21; I Cor. 14 and 15; with special reference to the sacrament of Holy Communion, I Cor. 11:16 ff.).

The church of the New Testament, thus pictured as a body of Christians mutually associated to maintain the life of Christ in one another, is not an abstraction, but is described in the New Testament in practical and concrete terms as the people who are actually functioning toward one another in this way. Wherever the church is described generically, as for example in Eph. 1, the application is at once to practical manipulations and processes; cf. Eph. 4-6.

The Lutheran Confessions amply reflect this basic structure of the church. They react against the church viewed as a political organization. In order to stress that the church is not a power structure or represented exclusively in the hierarchy under the Roman pontiff, but that it is simply the aggregate of Christians, the Confessions do not employ the distinction between the invisible and visible church. In fact, the Apology makes an outright attack on this concept of the church as a "Platonic idea."[2] In terms of the "invisible-visible" distinction the Confessions could be summarized as teaching that in the visible church the invisible is actual, and rendered visible to the believer.[3]

The Confessions do employ a pair of categories which have become fateful for the understanding of the church and the ministry. This is the contrast between the church in the proper sense and the church in the larger sense.[4] Here comes the first source of variation in the interpretation of Scriptures on the doctrine of the church. The term "church in the proper sense" is applied to the basic concept of the saints, the body of Christ. The term "church in the larger sense" is described as the visible organization which includes also hangers-on

2 Apology of the Augsburg Confession, VII, VIII, 20; German: "Wir reden nicht von einer erdichteten Kirche, die nirgend zu finden ist."

3 Edmund Schlink, *Theologie der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften,* 2nd ed. (Munich, 1946), 302.

4 Augsburg Confession, VIII; cf. Schlink, *op. cit.,* 300.

and hypocrites. Do the Confessions mean to imply that this is a concession to human language? Or do they assert that the New Testament itself uses the term "church" in that fashion? It would seem that the Apology is suggesting in IV, 12 ff. that the idea is non-biblical.[5] Some studies of the Confessions have assumed that they proposed herewith to operate with a biblical category.[6] The significance of this situation is that the assumption could gain ground that when the Scriptures speak of the *Una Sancta,* they refer to the church in the proper sense; and whenever the Scriptures refer to a local congregation or to Christians in the given place, they are perforce describing a mixture of Christian and non-Christian. Others, of course, have maintained that the New Testament speaks of only one kind of church, and in any address to Christians in the given place speaks exclusively to Christians.[7]

This problem of the pertinence of Scripture is apparent also in another expression of the Confessions, the "marks of the church." They are the Word and sacrament.[8] The "invisible-visible" terminology has employed the "marks" as indications on the surface and to human senses of where the invisible church is located. Actually they have a deeper significance: they are the means by which the members of the church are actually brought into life and preserved. The former emphasis tends to limit the function of the visible church to the profession of Word and sacrament, to be dispensed in the assembly of the church. The latter emphasis reminds that men are made Christians by only one agency, the Word of God itself by means of the spoken Gospel and the sacraments. This accent suggests further definition of the activity of the Christian who has been brought into the church, namely, his fellowship with other Christians in the mutual sharing of the life in Christ by means of Word and sacrament.[9] Much Lutheran ecclesiology minimizes this so central and ample datum of the New Testament and therewith unduly limits the picture of the ministry.

5 Apology, VII, VIII, 12-22: secundum externos ritus.

6 Thesis VI of C. F. W. Walther, *Die Stimme unserer Kirche in der Frage von Kirche und Amt;* cf. Theodore Engelder, ed., *Walther and the Church* (St. Louis, 1938), 62. Matt. 13: 47, 48; 25: 1, 2; 18: 7; Gal. 1: 2; I Cor. 1: 2.

7 Francis Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics,* III, translated by Walter W. F. Albrecht from original of 1920 (St. Louis, 1953).

8 Apology, VII, VIII, 20: puram doctrinam evangelii et sacramenta.

9 Pieper, *op. cit.,* 415, 420.

We are now ready to confront the concept of the ministry according to the New Testament. It seems to me that the most ample and fundamental statement, least colored by subsequent questions of authority, apostolic succession, and nature of the call, is Eph. 4. This passage is central in the application which St. Paul makes to the affirmation that the members of the church in the body of Christ are one. Now they are to walk worthy of that vocation. This maintaining of the unity of God in Christ in the church, says the apostle, is to be the responsibility of "every one of us" (verse 7). The gift of Christ, the grace of God by which this unity is to be preserved, is enhanced and fostered by special gifts, and these are people whom the ascended Christ puts to work in the church.

> And he has given us some men as apostles, some as prophets, some as missionaries, some as pastors and teachers, in order to fit his people for the work of service, for building the body of Christ, until we all attain unity in faith, and in the knowledge of the Son of God, and reach mature manhood, and that full measure of development found in Christ. We must not be babies any longer, blown about and swung around by every wind of doctrine through the trickery of men with their ingenuity in inventing error. We must lovingly hold to the truth and grow up into perfect union with him who is the head—Christ himself. For it is under his control that the whole system, adjusted and united by each ligament of its equipment, develops in proportion to the functioning of each particular part, and so builds itself up through love. (Eph. 4:11-16; Goodspeed.)

The contributions of this passage to the doctrine of the ministry are: the recognizing of a series of agents of Christ parallel to the apostles; the defining of their agency as the equipping of the members of the church toward a service and ministry which all the members carry out; the centrality of the Word of Christ as the tool by which all the members of the church edify one another; the task of the agents of the Word to facilitate this use of the Word of Christ by each member of the church toward each other one. The agents of the Word—the "special servants," we might call them according to this passage—are varied. First are the apostles because they were first on the scene. Then are mentioned the prophets, probably the people who, under special guidance of the Holy Spirit, provided direct revelation to supplement that given by the apostles in the early days of the church. The evangelists are evidently the proclaimers of the Gospel, some of them

doing that task exclusively, like Philip after the dispersal of the church at Jerusalem, others performing the task as part of their total ministry, since the preaching of the Gospel is basic in every other consideration (note II Tim. 4:5; I Cor. 2). Then come pastors and teachers. It would be interesting to know whether St. Paul was thinking about one craft and person under those two designations, just as the verbs "teach and preach" are bracketed so frequently in the New Testament. For the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as it takes hold of the individual through its initial proclamation of the grace of God in the redeeming work of Jesus Christ, needs to be imparted through a process not simply of proclamation, but of teaching, whereby the fact of forgiveness and new life is ingrained into the on-going faith and behavior, mutual care and edification, of the holy Christian church.

In connection with the designation "pastors and teachers" the New Testament elsewhere employs two other nouns. They are *presbyteros,* a concept possibly borrowed from the Jewish leader of the synagogue, designating the principal of a group of Christians in a given place responsible for their training and worship; and *episkopos*, overseer, in the King James Version translated "bishop."

The New Testament seems to employ the terms pastor, presbyter, bishop, interchangeably. This is significant for pointing up how our own time is hampered in the employing of Scripture data when "elder" can be a part-time lay official, a teacher, or an ecclesiastical supervisor of others; when "bishop" represents a hierarchical level above pastors; and when our term "the ministry" is thought of as congruent with the office of pastor. A useful corollary to Eph. 4 is St. Paul's address to the elders of Ephesus, Acts 20:28-32, and there this equation becomes quite evident:

> Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to forward the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. . . . Now brethren, I commend you to God and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified.

Significant is the concept of "pastor" here set forth. The accent is on the act of feeding, an analogy for supplying the Word of Christ in

adequate manner and protecting from false teaching. But significant is also the concept "overseer." In St. Peter's address to the elders (to whom he describes himself an elder also, I Peter 5:2-4) he describes this "overseer" as feeding the flock of God and as being, not a lord over, but an example to, the flock. Evidently we have in the concept of "overseer" the same function which is described in Eph. 4:12, the "perfecting of the saints" for their task of ministry and mutual edification. This "oversight" is closely related to the structure of the church, envisioned in the New Testament, in which each member of the church was thought of as being in service to every other one. The special servant of the Word had the task, then, in addition to the service of love and edification which he shared with every other Christian, to foster this service and watchfully to provide for it in those whom he serves as a special agent.

Historically, oversight in the direction of feeding and of protecting the mutual edification of the church very rapidly yielded to oversight of a series of levels in the ministry. Even the term "deacon" or servant became preempted for a lower level of ecclesiastical officials. Thus distinction in rank was introduced and the original function of apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor and teacher, presbyter, overseer was distorted. Already before A.D. 110 Ignatius professed astonishment that the Philadelphians should question his authority as a bishop and the biblical proof which he offered for it.[10]

One of the sources of confusion from the beginning was the relation of the various servants of the Word to the apostles. That both had a relation to the church was apparent. That the apostles were called by Jesus Christ was apparent, but did subsequent ministers, pastors, teachers receive their validation from the apostles or with the apostles from Christ through the church? Very early Matt. 16:18.19 was interpreted to signifiy that the apostolate, and specifically that of Peter, was basic for the pastorate of subsequent generations. Similarly Matt. 18:15-20 was construed as a conferring of the office of the keys specifically upon the disciples to whom the words were originally addressed. The Lutheran Confessions, in repudiating the Roman pontiff, interpreted these passages to represent a conferring of the

10 Ignatius of Antioch, "Letter to the Philadelphians," in Kirsopp Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, Loeb Classical Library (London, 1919), I.

office of the keys upon the whole church.[11] The Church of Sweden, whose attitude to the apostolic succession makes possible intercommunion with the Anglican Church, does not make the same use of these passages as the Anglican or Roman Churches,[12] and the Church of Sweden is having its own internal conversations on this subject.[13]

Yet even on the modest level of the pastorate the problem of rule has been a difficulty. Exegetically the point of comparison of the figure "shepherd" has been made to stress "leading" rather than feeding. Perhaps Rev. 2:27, 12:5, and 19:15 suggest that the term was beginning to lose its original accent by the end of the first century. Interesting parallel terms are Heb. 13:7, 17, 24, "rule" in the sense of "guide"; and I Tim. 3:4, 5, 12; 5:17, "rule" in the sense of "be over." Obviously, with the growth and complication of the structure of the early churches, a certain amount of administrative activity paralleled the teaching and feeding. As the wealth and size of the church increased, its pastors became executives as well as teachers, and this procedure obtains in the Roman Catholic Church to the present moment. The church of the Augsburg Confession made pastors spiritual agents of the church and moral agents of the government simultaneously. The Calvinistic churches began to distinguish between teaching and ruling elders, and assigned to the former the role of the minister of the Word.[14]

Obviously, the question is of more than academic concern to teachers of future pastors, for they are charged with the task of equipping future pastors not merely with the words that they are going to say or the skills with which they are going to say them, but with the attitudes which are to drive them in their ministry. As American churches grow in wealth and prestige they, too, tend to set up the equivalent of hierarchies, they put administrative demands upon their theologically trained workers, they breed expectations of advancement and power. To me it seems essential, if a ministry should be trained which is in the spirit of the New Testament, to preserve the accent of "feeding"

11 Tract on the Power and Primacy of the Pope, 22-26.

12 Olof Linton in Anders Nygren, ed., *This Is the Church,* translated by C. C. Rasmussen (Philadelphia, 1952), 128 ff. On Rome see R. Newton Flew, *The Nature of the Church* (New York, 1952), 26. On the Anglicans see *ibid.,* 135.

13 Cf. Eric H. Wahlstrom, "High Church Movement vs. Confessions in Sweden," in *The Lutheran Quarterly,* VII (Feb., 1955), 51 ff.

14 Flew, *op. cit.,* 102.

in the pastorate, to portray church administration as the adroit and constructive supervision of many Christians at their tasks of mutual ministry rather than power politics and lordship, and thus to safeguard the structure of our churches as gatherings of people bound together by the fellowship of Christ rather than by subservience to human authority. Ultimately the whole concept of "authority" needs rethinking. That which achieves its ends through threat or execution of penalty is foreign to the church of Christ (John 18:36, 37). That is the authority of Christ which, bringing men into bondage under him, sets them free from sin, death, and the world (II Cor. 4:7; II Thess. 3:7-9).

It remains to review the position of the Lutheran Confessions on the ministry, as far as that has not already been indicated. A particular problem is the relation of supervisory (episcopal) offices to that of the parish ministry. At this point we confront one of the major areas of sensitiveness on the doctrine of the church; for Scripture and Confessions stress that the church is not a politically organized institution at all. Relation of pastors to bishops is therefore left unclear. The result is two contrasting positions. The one is that bishops are simply servants of the Word in charge of the preaching of the Gospel in the same way and by the same authority as the parish pastor.[15] The other is that bishops and other officials are representatives of the individual congregations and as such have only advisory power.[16]

Another pair of contrasting positions grows out of the channel through which Jesus Christ himself is Lord of the church and therefore the giver of the task of the ministry. Does the task of the ministry derive from the royal priesthood of all believers, who assign their functions to the minister on their behalf,[17] or does it stem from Christ's choice of the apostles which is at the same time his commission to the entire church?[18] The alternative is not discussed in the Confessions in this form.

On the function of church administration and its relation to the

15 Schlink, *op. cit.*, 337.

16 Pieper, *op. cit.*, 428.

17 Schlink, *op. cit.*, 330, listing positions which he thinks untenable; on *Uebertragung* see Pieper, *op. cit.*, 458.

18 Schlink, *op. cit.*, 326, quoting Apology, XIII, 11; it is on the power of the ministry, but not on its inclusion in the apostolate.

ministry, bishops and pastors properly have authority only through the Gospel. The church of the Augsburg Confession found it reasonable that the secular authority should have the administrative task of protecting the church and providing for its physical needs.[19]

II. The Call

Now let us glance more directly at the manner in which the servant of the Word receives his mandate from Christ to feed the flock of Christ. This is the doctrine of the call. It involves the rite of ordination. The interpretation of the basic Scriptural data is sharply tinged by subsequent developments. The problem is not difficult where we have the story of the disciples and of St. Paul directly called by Jesus Christ (Matt. 10:1; Acts 13:2; Rom. 1:1; I Cor. 1:1). Nor is it difficult to sense the special quality of this call as compared with the general call to the holy Christian church (Rom. 8:28; Eph. 4:1). It is easy to relate this concept of our Lord's direction of his chief workers into their task to a concept of "sending" in John 17:18. It should be said, however, that in St. Paul's language many people besides the Twelve and himself were termed apostles; thus Barnabas (Acts 14:14), Apollos (I Cor. 4:6-9), Silas and Timothy (I Thess. 1:5; 2:6). Evidently some apostles received their mandate directly from Christ; others mediately through the church, as Paul and Barnabas at Antioch (Acts 13:2, 3; 14:14) although in Paul's case we see that he recognized that call as coming from Christ. Paul calls his helpers the messengers or apostles of the churches, II Cor. 8:23. However they received their mandate, they did the work of the churches.

Some of the words translated in the King James Version "call" refer to the initial conferring of the mandate to the ministry of the Word. Acts 16:10, in the account of the "Macedonian call," refers to the direction to preach in a certain locality (*proskaleo*). Acts 13:2 (*proskaleo*) speaks of the Holy Ghost calling Barnabas and Saul; how his intention was communicated to the church at Antioch is not described. The meaning of *kaleo* in I Tim. 6:12 seems to be the call to faith; then the "profession before many witnesses" in this verse would seem not to refer to some sort of ceremony of ordination.

19 Schlink, *op. cit.*, 348.

Several words are translated in the King James Version "ordain" and are thought to give a clue as to the means by which the call of the Spirit to the ministry was signalized or rendered palpable.[20] Titus was to "ordain elders in every town" (1:5). Jesus (Mark 3:14) made (*poieo*) the twelve to be with him. John 15:16 puts *tithemi* into the lips of Jesus concerning the disciples; I Tim. 2:7 has Paul employ the same word concerning his being appointed a preacher. Much has been made of *cheirotoneo* in Acts 14:23 and II Cor. 8:19 as suggesting a choice by ballot of the churches which guided the appointment.[21]

To what extent is the term "laying on of hands" identifiable as an act of ordination of ministers in the New Testament? Passages evidently referring particularly to the induction of ministers are Acts 6:6, the commissioning of the seven; 13:1-3, Paul and Barnabas; I Tim. 4:14 and II Tim. 1:6, Timothy's induction. I Tim. 5:22, "lay hands suddenly on no man," may possibly refer to a similar action. Dr. Davis gathers from these statements that there was some sort of solemn act of commissioning; that there was no standard practice as to whether apostles, or elders as a group, or the entire church in assembly performed the act of induction; and that in every instance the act of induction was by the church directly, or by the elders, "the church itself acting in their action."[22]

Fifteen centuries had produced, by the time of the Lutheran Reformation, a legal structure of functions of the ministry and a doctrine of order far beyond the concepts of the New Testament. Central to the system was the office of bishop, who himself was subject to the bishop of Rome. The bishop had two great authorities. The *potestas ordinis,* or right of consecrating the clergy, was the means by which the bishop channeled divine grace to the people through the ministration of sacraments by properly constituted clergy. The *potestas jurisdictionis* or right of administration involved the application of church law and the maintaining of the entire structure of discipline by which the people of the church were kept on the right road.[23] Article XXVIII of the Augsburg Confession swept this time-hallowed structure aside

20 Henry Grady Davis, "The Ministry in the New Testament," in *Chicago Lutheran Seminary Record,* LVII, No. 3 (July, 1952), 27.

21 Pieper, *op. cit.,* 453.

22 Davis, *op. cit.,* 28.

23 Cf. the summary in Karl Mueller, *Kirchengeschichte* (Tübingen, 1923), II, 12.

as an invasion of civil order and redefined the *potestates* in New Testament equivalents:

> There belongs to the bishops as bishops, that is, to those to whom has been committed the ministry of the Word and the Sacraments, no jurisdiction except to forgive sins, to judge doctrine, to reject doctrines contrary to the Gospel, and to exclude from the communion of the Church wicked men whose wickedness is known, and this without human force, simply by the Word (20, 21).

The Apology, XIV, actually utilized the medieval terms for new definitions:

> The bishop has the power of the order, that is, the ministry of word and sacraments, and he has the power of jurisdiction, that is, the authority to excommunicate those guilty of open crimes and again to absolve them if they are converted and seek absolution (13).

It should also be said that the Augsburg Confession made bishops and pastors synonymous (cf. XXVIII, 8, 30).

What, according to the Confessions, replaces the consecrating and administrating function of bishops in the appointment of the clergy? First comes a redefinition of who possesses the keys: it is the entire church (Tractatus 24, 25, 26; Smalcald Articles, III, VII, 1). Hence the whole church has and should retain the authority to call, elect, and ordain ministers (Tr. 67-71). Ordination is, then, the ratification of the election of pastors and bishops by the people (Tr. 72). But, according to the Augsburg Confession, XIV, "No one should publicly teach in the church or administer the sacraments unless he be regularly called." Ordination, in the sense of the establishing and inducting of ministers, is thus a sacrament, in the terms of the Apology, XIII, 12, 13: "For the church has the command to appoint ministers, which should be most pleasing to us, because we know that God approves this ministry, and is present in the ministry." Schlink derives from this accent a repudiation of the idea that the church merely assigns its own functions to the minister (*Uebertragung*), and a confirmation of the principle that the church appoints a man to an office founded by God in which he acts on behalf of God and in the place of Jesus Christ.[24]

24 Schlink, *op. cit.*, 331 f.

Conclusion

From these very brief references, which obviously leave unanswered many technical questions concerning the various functions and levels of the ministry of the Word and the various means for bringing God's call to men for these tasks, a few implications for the training of pastors can be drawn.

A Lutheran theological seminary must contribute much to the pastor's understanding of his task and therefore to his sense of being called by God. A document of vocation comes to the candidate for the ministry, telling him that he has been called to its pastorate. Yet actually the heavenly Father has been employing many more agents in the process of directing him to his task—parents and other teachers, pastors and Christian friends. In the seminary these convictions become clarified and focused. On the one hand, sentimental and egocentric moods of "feeling called" need to be put in their proper place; on the other, any sense has to be averted of entering upon a ministry of the Word for the sake of ascending some fancied *gradus ad Parnassum*. With emoluments of the ministry still somewhat slight, compensations in terms of prestige, studious leisure, white-collar tasks, and distinctions of pastor among people or special worker among pastors may insinuate themselves into the expectations of the theological student. Here it behooves us all to clarify throughout the years of seminary training that the pastor is called by God to do God's task to God's people through God's Word. Opportunities are manifold: courses and conferences in orientation, all of the theological disciplines, and particularly those in systematics and biblical interpretation, with the practical operations of the parish minister in worship, preaching, parish administration, and pastoral care not far behind. We ourselves, in our entire bearing as servants of the Word and the church and our own respect for God, God's Word, and God's people, can set the tone for what we say on this subject. It seems to me that we need not attempt to grade the church's helpers in some sort of system, with the parish pastorate at the top; I fancy myself neither higher nor lower in the scheme of the church and the Word than I was when I was a parish pastor. We can take seriously the apostle's list of operations and the one Spirit who is at work in them all, and try to communicate that respect for all to our young men (I Cor. 12:8-12).

A Lutheran theological seminary must contribute to the pastor's understanding of the authority for the task. It will not do simply to keep asserting that his "authority is Christ," for the proudest bishop has been able to crack his secular whip with the good conscience that he speaks for Christ. A rather high proportion of ministerial students sense an inferiority physically or in personality to the robust and extrovert characters in training for business or public life or industry. It is just these men who are apt to have an inner satisfaction that they have found a way to excel through the authority of the ministry in the church. Here it remains endlessly our task to emphasize that when Christ said, "One is your master, Christ" (Matt. 23:10), he was not clearing the way for our saying, "Therefore Christ's men are masters, too," and to stress Peter's dictum, "Not as lords" (I Pet. 5:3). Our time with its stress on guidance and psychological persuasiveness seems to have reduced the threat which prevailed in an earlier day for meekness to God's ministers; yet often the tacit goals of our young men behind the facade of "clean personnel work" are those of authority and trust. This is a thing to teach in every discipline of our schools and by means of every extra-curricular routine and contact: that God's people are to be led through the Gospel's taking hold of and remaking their wills day by day to conform to God's; that any operation to shape people's conduct by any other means is law and sword, not Christ and his Spirit. Here especially church history, with its quick glimpses at deterioration, collapse, renewal, and new deterioration, should prove helpful.

A Lutheran theological seminary must contribute to the pastor's understanding of the nature of his task as one of feeding and implementing people that they might feed one another. Too easily our task shrinks to the dimension of telling young men what the right doctrines are so that they will repeat them; what the right interpretations of Scripture are so that they will publish them; what the proper routines of the parish ministry are so that they will carry them out as representatives of the people. Our task is infinitely greater: to train our men in the skills to formulate and explore those doctrines, to interpret and search those Scriptures, to conduct those parish operations and services, always to the end that the next man may hand them on to the other, frequently in the very situation in which we are minister-

ing to them. The pastor is to be a crucial link in the chain reaction described in I Tim. 2:2: "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." The symbolism of the pastor in the church is not really a man in a chancel, facing the altar and praying instead of the people, turning to the people and preaching while they all listen; but it would be more appropriately the pastor in the narthex, prompting the entire congregation to lay its prayers and praises upon the altar of God, speaking the Word of God in Gospel and sacrament so that each member of the congregation is exhorting each other one and showing forth Christ's death till he come. This is the work of the bishop, and it is a good thing (I Tim. 3:1; cf. Eph. 4:11 ff.). All of us share in shaping young men to such a ministry. It looks like a bundle of functions and practices, yet both in seminary and in pastorate the functional and the theoretical need to be tightly fused in the mind. We have found how important field work is in training for a true ministry; yet again and again the most theoretical discipline of symbolics or exegesis is essential to interpret to the young man what he was doing and what he is going to do. It is in this function of the ministry that we can most signally stress and hand on our Lutheran heritage of insight into the holy ministry and the church, and most effectively guide our students to walk the golden mean between a secularizing activism and bleak trumpeting of words.

Finally, as the seminary contributes to this understanding of the ministry and prepares for its skills, it will make a great contribution to the ecumenical task. It seems to me that the one resolution to the impasse of order lies in the recognition that there is indeed an apostolic succession, that it consists in the church's sending out men at the task of God for which Jesus prayed, namely, to cause men to believe through the Word which the first apostles spoke. That process takes no glue of bishops, but a foundation stone of Christ to which each subsequent generation is fused by the church itself, bound in the unity of the Spirit, to which the church's ministry equips and fits in every age.[25] In another way the seminary will contribute even more directly. Ecumenical leaders have the misgiving that the movement does not reach the grassroots—and of course that means that it is not a move-

25 Cf. T. O. Wedel in *Religion in Life*, XXIV, No. 2 (Spring, 1955).

ment, for the people are the church. A true understanding of the ministry, its divine mandate and call and its holy Word, aims at making each Christian responsible for each other one, regardless of denominational barrier, right in the domain of family and friendship and neighborhood. As the products of our schools properly play their part in that plan of God, they shall contribute toward overcoming the hindrances set up by previous generations.

Is the Coexistence of the Old and New Man Biblical?

By Roy A. Harrisville

BEFORE proceeding to answer the question with which this article deals, we need to examine briefly those New Testament passages where the discussion regarding the "old" and "new man" occurs. That discussion is limited to the Pauline epistles, and more particularly to the Ephesian, Colossian, and Roman letters.

In Eph. 2:15, Paul speaks of Christ's "abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man in place of two, so making peace, and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross. . . ."[1] Here Paul characterizes the life of Jew and Gentile, before or apart from Christ, as one of entity. Prior to the coming of Jesus, the Israelitish community had been a self-contained entity. Necessarily so, in order that God's purpose might be fulfilled within it. But in relation to those existing outside that community, the exclusive character of Israel proved to be a barrier producing a reciprocal hostility. It was that barrier, producing enmity between Jew and Gentile, which Christ broke down. The manner in which he did so was by making of no effect the legal provisions of the law which gave Israel its peculiar character as an exclusive, self-contained entity. Christ's flesh was the arena where that which separated was destroyed. Paul writes that the separation came to an end in order that Christ might create "in himself one new man in place of two, so making peace." In contrast to the exclusive character of that one segment of humanity, an exclusiveness which once brought about disunity, the totality of humanity had now been made one in Christ. Hence the "new man" in vs. 15 is equivalent to the "one body" in vs. 16, for it expresses the idea of the community of believers as a total personality in Christ. In this passage, therefore, the "new man" does not describe the individual Christian, but rather

1 R.S.V. translation.

the community. It is the Christian community which is the "new man," and thus it corresponds to Christ.

It was the peculiar contribution of Traugott Schmidt, a young Lutheran theological student killed in World War I, and whose work on the body of Christ was published posthumously, to point out the intimate relation between Paul's idea of the "new man" and his idea of the body of Christ. Schmidt indicated that the figure of the body was only a special form of that general idea of a total personality (*Gesamtpersönlichkeit*), derived from Hebrew thought, which Paul preferred, as is suggested by its frequent appearance in his epistles.[2] According to this passage in Ephesians, God's purpose that all men attain the goal he intended for them had now begun to be realized. The destiny of Israel had become identical with that of all humanity. The significance of the person of Jesus was not confined to the fact that he was a unifying factor between two formerly hostile parties, but lay particularly in the fact that life had now become life with Christ. Since the community had entered into Christ, it was not only ruled by his person, but was actually held together by his life. According to vs. 16, Christ reconciled both in one body with God. The "one body" of vs. 16 is thus parallel to the "in himself" of vs. 15. The body is the person of Christ, and in the body, as in Christ himself, the Christians had become one new man.

In Eph. 4:22-24 and in Col. 3:10 there occur expressions peculiar to Paul in which he speaks of "putting off" the old and "putting on" the new man. Christ marks the division between the old and the new; hence that which existed prior to or apart from him is characterized by the term "old." When modifying the word "man," "old" expresses that condition anthropologically. In regard to the individual, it marks his relation to all that is characterized by the word "old" (in this particular passage called the "former manner of life"). The "old man" is thus man determined by the conditions which prevail under the old con: to the transitoriness of the old creation of which he is an integral part; to the reign of sin, death, and the law; and to the evils inherent in that "former manner of life." The "old man" is

2 Traugott Schmidt, *Der Leib Christi, Eine Untersuchung zum urchristlichen Gemeindegedanken* (Leipzig, 1919), p. 102.

therefore the non-eschatological man, man as he lives in relation to a seemingly unchanging world.

Paul, having enjoined his readers to put off the old man, exhorts them to be renewed in the "spirit of their minds" and to "put on" the new man. This new man Paul describes as having been created in "true righteousness and holiness." Note that the word "created" in vs. 24 is in the aorist. That means that a definite historical event is indicated. That event is the "new man" which God created through Jesus Christ. The individual, therefore, is not invited to perform a miracle, but to avail himself of an opportunity already present to him. Just as the "old man," so the "new man" is an *endyma,* a uniform, and Paul appeals to his readers to identify themselves with this new man, created when Christ brought his church into being. The appeal is not from an individualistic standpoint; it is an appeal to become part of that total personality in Christ.

In Col. 3:10, the "old man" is viewed from the standpoint of the totality of his activity (i.e., "with his deeds").[3] Paul's thought here is far from being a mere moralism—not only the deeds of the old man are to be put off, but the old man himself. Actually, the apostle is fighting against a Hellenistic or Jewish type of moralism. He has admonished his readers to put off evil works, and their natural reaction would be to construe the Christian life as a moral reformation. With that Paul would agree, but in addition he would command them to put off the old man. For Paul it was not sufficient that his readers' behavior should be different, while their "man" remained the same. The force of the imperatives in this passage, as well as in Eph. 4, indicates that the putting off and on are to be done absolutely.

Paul's words in Rom. 12:2 are an answer to the question whether or not such putting on presupposes sinlessness in the believer. There he enjoins his readers not to be "conformed to this world," but to be "transformed by the renewal of their mind." Paul's use of the imperative, "Do not be conformed," makes clear that the problem of sin remains a reality for the believer. And precisely because sin remains a reality for him, the believer is enjoined to reject the claims which the old eon still makes upon him. However, whereas this "conforming" was an inevitability for the old man, it is no longer so for the

3 Here the King James translation is to be preferred to the R.S.V.

new man. The second imperative, "Be transformed," makes clear not only that there is an alternative to "being conformed," but also that the activity enjoined corresponds with the true self of the new man. Rom. 12:2, then, gives us the clue that the explanation for the possibility of the believer's yielding to sin is to be found elsewhere than in the idea that he still possesses the old man.

Let us turn now to the question stated at the outset. In modern times Theodore Zahn and Paul Ewald have been the two most outstanding representatives of the idea of the coexistence of the old and the new man.[4] Zahn, commenting on Rom. 6:4, writes that the old man is still present in the believer and is not put off absolutely. Ewald, discussing the passages in Ephesians and Colossians, writes that the putting off and on is done "in principle." We noted that in the two latter passages the readers were commanded to put off the old man in the absolute sense. The imperative force of the verbs made that clear. But the fact that Paul elsewhere admonishes his readers to put away all manner of uncleanness (cf. I Cor. 5:7), though he had already described them as new in Christ, induced such men as Zahn and Ewald to interpret these passages as implying the coexistence of the old and the new man.

Zahn and Ewald fell into this error, first of all, because they neglected to differentiate clearly between the new life and the "putting on." The "putting on" differs from the new life inasmuch as it designates the mode of the new life and the conditions of its activity. The new life must be channeled, and therefore Paul commands the Christians to put on the new man. In other words, those whom Paul addresses already have the new life in them—they are already part of the new man in Christ—but in their actions they do not give expression to that new life. For to wear the old man means conformity with this world. The new life, however, is not a matter of individual choice but, according to Paul, is conditioned by the corporate life to which the Christians belong. Hence, the command to "put off" and "put on." The Christians needed to realize that there was a new life, and that that life was not only a change *in* this world, but a

4 Cf. Theodore Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, 1st and 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1910), p. 302, and Paul Ewald, *Die Briefe des Paulus an die Epheser, Kolosser und Philemon* (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1910), p. 207.

change *from* it into the corporate life of the body of Christ, i.e., into the "new man."

A further reason for Zahn's and Ewald's falling into this error is their conception of justification as a purely forensic act. For when justification is conceived merely as an act *in foro coeli,* then naturally the believer is not affected in any fundamental way. Then his renewal, which Paul so intimately connects with justification (e.g., in Titus 3:5), is something taking place only "ideally" or "in principle." Then the believer is in reality still the old man. But such an interpretation is not consonant with the Pauline doctrine. Moreover, the doctrine of the *imputatio* is a deviation from Luther himself. We are indebted to the modern Luther research carried on by men such as Karl Holl, Reinhold Seeberg, and Regin Prenter for making that fact clear.[5] Luther's concept of faith and justification is indissolubly united with his concept of *conformitas.* For Luther, the necessary basis for faith and justification is the believer's union with Christ, to whose suffering, death, and resurrection he is made to conform by the activity of the Holy Spirit. Luther writes:

"Wherefore, by faith in Christ the Christian is made one spirit and one with Christ."[6]

"For the faith of each one is both necessary and sufficient for remission of sins and for salvation, which (faith) brings Christ to us, that is, makes (us) one flesh, bone of (his) bones, and effects total communion with him."[7]

"For to believe in Christ is to put him on, to be made one with him."[8]

Wherever there is not this connection between *conformitas* and *fides*

5 It should be noted, however, that the only point of agreement between Prenter, on the one hand, and Holl and Seeberg on the other, is that Luther did not construe justification in terms of a merely theoretical imputation of the righteousness of Christ. From that point on, Prenter sharply disagrees with Holl and Seeberg. The latter interpret Luther's view of justification from a purely humanistic point of view, i.e., as a gradual process of justification (*Gerechtmachung*) identical with a growth in empirical piety. Prenter, however, contends that for Luther neither justification nor sanctification can be construed in terms of a gradually developing, unambiguous process in man. Cf. Regin Prenter, *Spiritus Creator* ("Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus," herausgegeben von Ernst Wolf, Zehnte Reihe, Band VI, München, 1954), pp. 78-80, 103-105.

6 *W.A.,* I, 593, 14.

7 *W.A.,* VIII, 599, 2 ff.

8 *W.A.,* II, 535, 24.

Christi, justification degenerates into a merely theoretical imputation of the merits of Christ won by his substitutionary satisfaction, and not the gift of the living Christ himself. Such a view reduces justification to an element in a system of merit and law entirely alien to Luther.[9]

The fact that Luther employs such terms as *justitia aliena, extranea,* or *extra nos* is in no way to be regarded as support for a forensic doctrine of justification. For Luther our alien righteousness is the living, personal Christ and not merely an abstract contribution of Christ.[10] The element of truth in the doctrine of the *imputatio* is that the believer may take no credit for what Christ accomplishes in him. But it may not be denied thereby that that "imputed" righteousness is real and present in the believer's life.[11]

The old orthodox Lutheran concept of justification, colored as it is by Melanchthonian and forensic views, and undoubtedly born out of intense reaction to the Augustinian piety, is not sufficient to make clear the truth of the biblical doctrine. An interpretation which has too long contrued justification in terms of the modern courtroom must give way to one which is more comprehensive in character.

We cannot underestimate the real contribution which Prenter has made in emphasizing Luther's concentration upon the Christocentric aspect of justification. For where the real and redeeming presence of Christ is understood as the basis of faith and justification, where the new man is not regarded as the believer viewed "sub specie aeternitatis" in the forensic sense, nor as a metaphysical quality dwelling in man in the old medieval sense, but rather as Christ himself

9 Cf. Prenter, *op. cit.,* p. 61, and also John Bollier, "The Righteousness of God" (*Interpretation,* Volume VIII, No. 4, October, 1954), pp. 412-413.

10 Therefore Luther, in describing the alien righteousness of Christ, uses the form: aliena justitia ab extra infusa, or, Que aliunde veniat in nos. *W.A.,* LVI, 247, 1 ff.; I, 140, 8 ff.; 219, 30 ff. Cf. also Prenter, *op. cit.,* p. 61.

11 ". . . this righteousness of God has a transient as well as an immanent aspect, for man is directly affected by the manifestation of this righteousness. When man chooses to win the divine approval through his own efforts by obedience to the law, he experiences the righteousness of God only as wrath, but when man responds to the self-revelation of God through faith in Christ, he experiences the righteousness of God as acceptable with God," Bollier, *op. cit.,* p. 413. Orthodox theologians often point out the fact that Luther uses the term *imputatio* or *reputatio,* as though such usage were in the support of a forensic interpretation of justification. However, the terms are to be regarded in the same manner as others employed by him (*aliena, extranea,* etc.), that is, as denoting man's righteousness as alien, but a righteousness which is nevertheless man's own because Christ has been given to him as a gift.

dwelling in the believer and to whom the believer is joined as member to one body, there a real return to the biblical, Pauline doctrine has been achieved.

The key to our discussion of coexistence is found in Rom. 7 and 8. There human existence is conceived in terms of total relationship, not in terms of an independent, self-contained entity.[12] The old man is thus man in relation to the old eon and to the conditions prevailing under it. His non-eschatological view of life regards sin as an inevitability which he may never escape.[13] In the renewal, by which man's personality undergoes a radical transformation, he enters into a corporate existence with Christ, i.e., becomes the new man. By the renewal of the mind, by which he recognizes God's lordship as supreme, he is in possession of the Spirit who enables him to live without sin (8:8-10). Hence, that which was an inevitability for him is no longer an inevitability. Negatively, he is freed from all that which formerly bound him (8:2); positively, he is free to live according to the will of God (8:4). This deliverance, however, is not to be construed in merely forensic terms, as though the newness mediated in baptism were only a metaphysical quality totally unrelated to the behavior of the individual. The believer's state is far from one of sinlessness, for the new life is an advance toward a final goal not yet realized (8:18). He is a new man, experiencing the blessings of the "coming eon" in his present existence. But that "coming eon" retains its continuity with the old eon as having been formed out of it; hence, the two eons coexist (not in juxtaposition, however, for one is continually being displaced by the other). The new man is thus an inhabitant of two eons. His self or ego, which has undergone the radical change and which can now choose to live the new life in Christ, relates him to the new eon, but he still lives in this world. He is still related to his environment, which is an integral part of the old eon. The destructive powers of that eon may still influence him (cf. 7:23). In this condition, it is still possible for him to sin (7:18-19), and, indeed, he does sin, *but he need not,* for that which has been given to him in Christ makes him a conqueror over sin (cf. 8:37). This ex-

12 Cf. Rom. 7:1-3, in which the old man is seen in his relation to the law, also Rom. 8, *passim,* in which the existence of the new man is an existence "in Christ," or "in the Spirit."

13 Man's relation to the law, which sin employs to do its deadly work, continues throughout his lifetime; he is never free from it. Cf. Rom. 7:1 ff.

plains the antithetical role of the "law of the mind" and the "law of sin in my members" in Rom. 7. But the struggle which arises out of this condition is the struggle of the *new man*. Paul's autobiography in Rom. 7, as interpreted by Augustine, Luther, Calvin, and the majority of Lutheran and Reformed theologians, is the confession of the new man. The old man never recognizes such inner conflict because he is completely under the domination of the powers prevailing in the old eon. Luther writes on Rom. 7:18.

"But here, in the carnal man, (these thoughts) by no means have a place, where the whole man is altogether flesh, because the Spirit of God does not abide in him. Therefore, the carnal (man) is not able to say: 'in me, that is, in my flesh,' as though he might willingly be anything else than flesh; but rather he is one with the flesh by consent to its concupiscence, just as a man and woman are one flesh in a figurative sense, but (he) in a carnal and sensual manner."[14]

It is the anthropology of the new man which predicates such a conflict.

In Rom. 8, which is intimately connected with Rom. 7, both in form and content, it is made clear that the Christian may exist without sin in spite of his relation to the old eon. This explains the antithetical role of "flesh" and "spirit" in that chapter. The existence which the new man lives in this world is only provisional. The old exists, but its power is broken because the new has come, and the spiritual development which has begun is only the beginning of the "glory" which will be revealed (8:18). Then the new man will have put off the "body of flesh" which related him to the old eon in his earthly existence, and will have realized the goal toward which he moved. This elicits Paul's great victory cry at the end of the eighth chapter (vss. 35 *ad finem*).

The new man, therefore, cannot at the same time be the old man, for it is impossible for man to be an integral part of this world in a non-eschatological sense and at the same time be under the lordship of God. It is the very nature of the new man that he "walks in newness of life." The exhortations to the new man to put away all uncleanness and evil are a command to assert his true self, a command to refuse to acknowledge the claims which the old eon makes upon

14 Johannes Ficker, *Luthers Vorlesung über den Römerbrief* ("Anfänge reformatorischer Bibelauslegung," Leipzig, 1908), I, p. 173.

him. Hence the question for the new man is, Should my spirit be subordinate to my environment by which I am conditioned? Paul answers, "No!" Though the new man still commits sin, he is no longer the "servant of sin" (Rom. 6:16-18)—he can be free. The old and the new eons still exist, but not in juxtaposition, and therefore they cannot be described in terms of tension. One is constantly growing and developing, whereas the other is gradually being overwhelmed. This fact, however, does not permit the conclusion that the individual who has undergone the renewal can be spoken of as being old and new at one and the same time. As has been pointed out, the terms "old" and "new" are descriptive of a total relationship, characterizing man according to that of which he is an integral part.

It should not be denied, however, that in Luther's lectures on Romans one also encounters passages which resemble the view of the two natures as represented by Ewald and Zahn.[15] For example, Luther writes on Rom. 4:7:

"Is there anyone, therefore, perfectly righteous? No, rather he is at the same time a sinner and righteous; a sinner in truth, but righteous by the imputation and sure promise of God, because he delivers from the former, until he heals perfectly. And because of this he is perfectly whole in hope, but in reality a sinner, but having the beginning of righteousness in order that he may seek always for more, always knowing himself to be unrighteous."[16]

And on Rom. 12:2:

"Man is always in non-being, in becoming, in being; always in lacking, in potentially having, in acting; always in sin, in justification, in righteousness, that is, (he is) always a sinner, always penitent, always righteous."[17]

However, upon more careful reading it is clear that Luther's use of the phrase *simul justus et peccator* is not to be regarded as supporting a doctrine of coexistence. In Luther the terms *peccator, caro, vetus homo* are predicated of the whole man if it lacks the Spirit of God.

15 *Ibid.*, II, 108. 12-14 (Rom. 4:7); II, 172. 28-31 (Rom. 7:18); II, 266. 24-267. 3 (Rom. 12:2).

16 *Ibid.*, II, 108. 12-14.

17 *Ibid.*, II, 266. 24-267. 3.

Likewise, the terms *justus, spiritus, novus homo* are predicated of the whole man if it is dominated by the Spirit. Luther writes:

"But because one and the same man consists totally of flesh and spirit, therefore to the whole man is ascribed both opposites, since they come from his opposite parts. For thus a communion of properties arises, since the same man is spiritual and carnal, righteous and a sinner, good and evil."[18]

"Behold how one and the same man at the same time serves the law of sin, is at the same time righteous and sins! For (Paul) does not say: 'my mind serves the law of God,' nor, 'my flesh the law of sin,' but 'I,' he says, 'the whole man, the same person, I am a slave to both.' "[19]

Far from supporting a doctrine of coexistence, Luther uses the terms *justus* and *peccator* in the same breath to describe the ambiguity of the believer's life. Whenever the believer takes refuge under the alien righteousness of Christ he is *justus;* whenever he seeks his own righteousness he is *peccator.*[20] It is the error of Pietism, into which Zahn and Ewald have fallen, which conceives the old or new man as a part of man and not the whole man, and hence speaks of a coexistence of two natures. But for Luther the "new man" is the risen and living Christ himself and not a metaphysical quality or "nature" in man existing in juxtaposition with the old man.[21]

Nevertheless, there is a difference between the manner in which the terms "old" and "new" are used in Paul and Luther. In Paul, the terms are always expressive of a corporate existence and are never construed individualistically. That is, they are always used in reference to an existence within or outside of the body of Christ. Hence for Paul the new man is the body of Christ, and the old man is man totally under the domination of the powers of the old eon. Luther, however, did not understand the terms from the standpoint of a corporate existence, but interpreted them in an exclusively individualistic manner. He used the terms old and new in the same breath to point out the tension or ambiguity in the life of the individual believer. Paul did not so employ the terms. The imperative force of the verbs

18 *W.A.,* LVI, 343, 16.
19 *W.A.,* LVI, 347, 2.
20 ". . . because they believe in Christ, whose righteousness covers them and is imputed to them, but also sinners, because they do not fulfill the law." *W.A.,* LVI, 347, 2.
21 Cf. Prenter, *op. cit.,* p. 88.

Paul uses to indicate putting off and putting on make clear that it is a question of either-or regarding the two. We may therefore conclude that Luther, in describing the ambiguity of the believer's life, employed the wrong terms, terms used by Paul to express a total, corporate existence, and, more specifically, that he failed to make the Pauline identification of the new man with the body of Christ. That Paul himself took the ambiguity of the believer's existence into account there can be no doubt, but, as we shall see, he employed other terms to express that ambiguity. It has already been pointed out that Luther had no intention of supporting a doctrine of the coexistence of two natures, but his lack of insight into the specifically biblical usage of the terms "old" and "new" may have helped pave the way for a dogma which has proved so popular in modern, scholastic orthodoxy.

Granting for the sake of argument that all that is at stake here is an unfortunate use of terminology, where may we turn for better terms to describe the individual existence of the believer, both with respect to his renewed, "true" self, and to that in him which relates him to this world? Paul's words in II Cor. 4:16 indicate the direction we may take. Here the apostle speaks of the "inner" and "outer" man. At first sight, the great similarity between this passage and those already discussed would suggest that the terms "inner" and "outer," "old" and "new" are synonymous. But "old" and "new" may not be predicated of the same individual. The terms used in this passage, however, are definitely predicated of the same individual. Here Paul is deliberately using terminology current in Hellenistic circles for distinguishing a peripheral from an innermost sphere in man. However, Paul's distinction between "outer" and "inner man" cannot be equivalent to that between body and soul, between a "lower" and a "higher" nature, for that purely Greek distinction is entirely foreign to him. The fact that he joins to each adjective the designation "man" indicates that for Paul, as well as for Luther, the "outer man" is the *totus homo* when he succumbs to the mortality and temporality of this world, and that the "inner man" is the *totus homo* when he is dominated by the Spirit of God. And yet, the difference between Paul and Luther does not consist merely in the fact that they employ different terms to express the ambiguity of the believer's existence. For

Paul, by his very choice of terms, apparently wants to make a differentiation in the believer's existence which is in some way comparable, though not equivalent to, the Greek differentiation (and, we might add, the differentiation made by modern scholastic orthodoxy). By describing the believer both as "inner" and "outer man," Paul suggests a difference between the believer's "conscious life" or "actual conduct," i.e., that which still relates him to the old eon (but not identical with "body" in the Greek sense), and his "renewed heart," i.e., that in him which has undergone a radical transformation (but not identical with "soul" in the Greek sense). The tension in the believer's life arises from the fact that his conduct must no longer be conditioned by outward circumstances since he has undergone a transformation. His "outer man" must be destroyed, crucified. This is what Luther has in mind when he speaks of the believer's being conformed to the sufferings and death of Christ. On the other hand, his new life in the body of Christ must constitute his whole existence. This is what Luther has in mind when he speaks of the believer's being conformed to Christ's resurrection.

The explanation for Paul's use of the terms "outer" and "inner" may be found in the fact that he needed a terminology to express the condition of the believer with respect to his individual existence. This was something for which the Hebrew language, with its concept of being in terms of relationship, had no well-defined equivalent. The explanation may further be found in the fact that Paul wished to make clear the great discontinuity between that which was effected in the individual by the divine activity and that in him which was still conditioned by his environment, by his life in this world.

In conclusion, the teaching that the Christian is both the old and the new man fails to take seriously terms which express a total relationship and which are so dear to the heart of St. Paul. But more than an incorrect use of terminology is involved. As we have seen in the case of Zahn and Ewald, such teaching has its basis in a purely forensic view of justification which regards the believer as being what he is in Christ only ideally or in principle. It has been made clear that this is an interpretation which Luther himself did not intend to support. Paul emphasizes that the believer is really and actually the new man, the new man in Christ, and he uses far different terminology

to describe that in the believer which still relates him to the old eon. The teaching of the coexistence of the old and new man cannot help but do violence to the New Testament concept of the body of Christ.

If a discussion such as this should motivate us to some kind of concrete action, I should like to suggest that we begin by searching for a happier expression to replace the terms which Luther uses in his Small Catechism to make clear the meaning of baptism, terms which tend to give support to the current doctrine of the coexistence of two natures. Originally the passage reads:

"What does such baptizing with water signify?"

"It signifies that the old Adam in us, together with all sins and evil lusts, should be drowned by daily sorrow and repentance, and be put to death; and that the new man should daily come forth and arise, to live before God in righteousness and holiness for ever."

Perhaps we might make the passage read thus:

"That our *outer man,* together with all sins and evil lusts, should be drowned by daily sorrow and repentance, and be put to death; and that the *inner man* should daily come forth and arise, to live before God in righteousness and holiness for ever."

On the face of it, a seemingly insignificant change. But to neglect making it could continue to give support to an idea which has caused much grief and misunderstanding in a study of the body of Christ and the believer's relation to it and to the world in which he still lives.

Professionalism and the Christian Faith

By Herbert Stroup

PROFESSIONALISM represents in the present period both a promise and a threat.

It is a promise in that it urges upon individuals and society the development of unusual talent for the maintenance of specialized societal functions. Through the full development of professionalism the community, at least theoretically, is supplied with better and more efficient services for its members. In fact, the claim may be made that the type of social order which is enjoyed in every developed nation in this age depends upon the high degree of expertness which has been developed in specific and coordinated professions.

It is this thought that Oswald Spengler had in mind, although in exaggerated form perhaps, in his *Decline of the West*. Said Spengler: "One figure is even more important than all the energy of master men that make cities grow out of the ground and alter the landscape, . . . the Engineer, the priest of the machine, the man who knows it. The very existence of industry depends upon the existence of a hundred thousand talented, rigorously schooled brains that command the technique and develop it onward and onward. . . . When, and only when, the crop of recruits for this army fails . . . industry must flicker out in spite of all that managerial energy and the workers can do."

Because the professional plays such a responsible role in modern society, Adam Smith was willing to grant him preferential economic treatment in his account of fundamental economics. Thus, in *Wealth of the Nations*, Smith stated: "We trust our health to the physician, our fortune and sometimes our wealth and reputation to the lawyer and attorney. Such confidence could not be safely reposed in people of a very mean or low condition. Their reward must be such as may give them that rank in society which so important a trust requires." So Adam Smith, even though he was a professor of moral theology in a Scottish university and believed thoroughly in "applied Chris-

tianity," relied in the final analysis for leadership in society not upon spiritual conditions or motivations, but upon "reward" and "rank." These symbols in his estimation prevent disastrous social anarchy and through complex specialization enable men to secure the good life.

But professionalism, despite its apparent benefits, is being recognized recently as also constituting a vast and significant social problem which calls for urgent attention. For one thing, many have noticed that professionalism, far from developing individual capacities and bringing personal fulfillment, has often brought about the depersonalization of the person. The expert becomes an expert by becoming, to a surprisingly great degree, cut off from the general flow of human experience and by magnifying certain aspects of general living while dwarfing the meaning of many others. He becomes truly a "slave" or an abject dependent upon the corps of professionals who constitute for him the "church" of his existence in which ultimate meaning for him is revealed. Yet, his subjection and depersonalization is not a spiritual creation. It is, in fact, the opposite. It is the mechanization of man.

This tremendously meaningful process of "naturalizing" man is not found in isolated cases. Modern man, as David Reisman indicates in *The Lonely Crowd,* has become "other-directed," that is, he has lost the guidance of conscience and of tradition and depends increasingly upon the statistically compounded morality of the masses. Henry Amiel puts the matter less technically when he says: "To crush what is spiritual, moral, human . . . in man by specializing him; to form mere wheels of the great social machine, instead of perfect individuals; to make society and not conscience the center of life—this is the dominant drift of our epoch." So it is that what appears superficially to be a socially defensible arrangement contains problems and evils which strike to the core of the humanism implicit in the Christian faith in so far as that outlook urges respect of the individual.

The development of professionalism in Western history, moreover, has nourished a conception of the nature of man which in recent times has also come under severe questioning. This conception suggests, if it does not actually champion among certain educational leaders, that ordinary men may become extraordinary through specialization. It further suggests that it is only through the intellectual

and skill powers of such extraordinary men that our civilization may be maintained and developed. Both assumptions may be revelatory of the degree to which modern man has lulled himself into unwarranted pride in the face of catastrophic dangers.

May it not be, however, using such assumptions, that modern men have been able to create a form of society which is incapable of adequate control by ordinary men, even those who have been presumably made into extraordinary creatures through educational advantages? Perhaps the contrast between the pre-atomic period and the world as we now know it can best be compared with that of the contrast between the early period of Roman history and the later. In *Roman Britain* Professor R. G. Collingwood wrote: "Early Roman history has been described as the history of ordinary people doing extraordinary things. In the late empire it took an extraordinary man to do anything at all, except carry on routine." In our times, too, there is a deep need for extraordinary men—a mass of them. Professionalism in increased variety is offered as the "answer" by many. But the proof is still wanting for the metamorphic potentialities of ordinary men under educational guidance. The truth of the matter seems to be that men, even professionals, are perennially ordinary and at times even "ornery." Professionalism needs a fresh appraisal of its "doctrine of man," especially in the light of the Christian faith.

Professionalism began under the sponsorship of the church in the Middle Ages, broke away from spiritual premises and controls as the relations between church and society changed in the Renaissance, and developed into patchwork fragmentization in the most recent times and on a secular basis. In the Middle Ages all work was related closely to the fundamental spiritual theme of Christianity. The physician, priest, lawyer, architect, and others believed that their work was related to God and his will for them and for society.

The intensity of such belief, of course, varied, but its basic significance can scarcely be doubted. Thus a textbook on medical ethics of the period advises on the deportment of the early English physician in the following manner: "First it behoveth him that will profit in this craft that he will set God afore evermore in all his works, and evermore call meekly with heart and mouth his help; and sometimes help from his earnings poor men after his might, that they by their

prayers may get him grace by the Holy Ghost. And that he be not temerarious or boastful in his sayings or deeds; and abstain he from much speech, and most among great men; and answer he slyly to things asked, that he be not caught up in his words."

What was true of medicine, moreover, was true also of the other budding professions. Recruitment, the acceptance of a common outlook on self and society, the difficulties surrounding the employment of a controlling ethics, and other features of early professionalism found their support and answer in the church and in the Christian worldview. In fact, a considerable bulk of the professionals of that period were clerics who believed that their vocational calling included the services which now belong to the "secular" professions.

H. H. Benson, in *The Church of England,* has said that "the loss of consequence involved for the ordinary clergyman by the substitution of the pastoral for the sacerdotal conception of the Christian ministry can hardly be overstated." The implications of this loss for professionalism also is ramified and meaningful. Instead of experts having their rootage in the Christian sense of vocation, a new rationale for the existence of the professions developed. At its core was the notion that the professional person seeks to serve his own advancement and satisfactions through professional services of serious and worthy dimensions to the community. The keys to this newer view of professionalism were not necessarily anti-Christian, although they hardly qualified for the fullest recognition as Christian enterprises.

As the influence of the churches dwindled, so the growth of a secularly oriented professionalism took place. Education and practice became independent of the organizational as well as the theoretical and ethical guidance of Christianity. The professions were on their own and liking it! This was the period of which Dickens had Pickwick speak of "the Articled Clerk, who has paid a premium, and is an attorney in perspective, who runs a tailor's bill, receives invitations to parties, goes out of town every Long Vacation to see his father, who keeps live horses innumerable; and who is, in short, the very aristocrat of clerks."

At least two innovations appeared in Western society in the face of growing and secular professionalism: the rise of professional education and the control of professional practice by the state. It is true,

for example, that many persons flocked to Leyden, Basel, and Bologna for medical education even before medicine became a relatively independent and secular calling, but in the main the technical schools of medicine as well as those for the other nascent professions came about as these professions were able to secure a profitable following outside the church. Educationally, moreover, the universities have never genuinely done more in their education for the professions than reflect in their own divisions, separate schools, administrations, courses, etc., the fragmentized professionalism which arose with the decline of the churches. In countries where the Eastern Orthodox Church flourished there was little opportunity for either the development of professions or educational training for them because of Turkish oppression, with the major exception of Russia, where the universities to some degree mirrored those of the West.

Even at the present the universities are deplorably caught in a web of "divisionism" which has prevented a more coordinated, perhaps even consistent and unified, kind of education for experts. The stirrings in a few institutions of higher learning on the problem of offering a more reasoned vocational education for needed professionals is now in evidence, although it is difficult to perceive a general awareness in excess of that which has generally obtained in the last several centuries. The professional of today with his intensive training in expertness still suffers from that same semantic illness which was ascribed to a character in the *Tatler:*

"When I married this gentleman he had a very handsome estate, but upon buying a set of microscopes he was chosen a Fellow of the Royal Society, from which time I do not remember ever to have heard him talk in a manner that any of his family could understand." How well our modern professionals remind us of the members of the Academy of Projectors in *Gulliver's Travels!*

The educators, as is so often the case, were unable, however, to bring system into the training of professionals. Not only did they not integrate professional education with general education, but they were far from agreement among themselves as to the desirable means and content of education within each of the professions. Increasingly the community needed to protect itself in part from the educators and their professionals. Government is commonly the device for achieving

such protection. Licensing by means of examinations is proven to be the most suitable governmental means of insuring at least a minimal plane of competence. When licensing occurred, the universities virtually ceased to educate their students for the tasks which the professions themselves had defined. They abrogated to a large extent some of the essential aspects of professional training, such as the ethical stability of practitioners and the problem of suitable personal motivation for recruits, and dwelt at length on the techniques of the field of practice and the knowledge necessary to pass the licensing examinations. They were content by and large to admit that the standards of the government were adequate for them. On the other hand, they prided themselves on being of service to the community in a practical way.

The manner in which universities, in their special training programs for professionals, bow to the requirements of licensing is indicated in the experience of Graham Wallas in his older work, *Our Social Heritage*. Says Wallas: "I myself, for instance, was working a few years ago at a problem of human 'purpose,' and it occurred to me that I might get help from the current literature of jurisprudence. Lawyers, on and off the Bench, spend part of their lives examining instances of human conduct, and in arguing whether acts are or are not 'intentional' or 'willful,' or whether the doer is or is not responsible for them. Their textbooks might, I thought, contain a stock of carefully analysed experience as to human motive. I therefore wrote to the ablest and most learned professor of law whom I know, one of the very few who have preserved freshness of mind throughout an English legal training. He replied that I would find 'the generally accepted view as to intention and motive' in Stephen, 'but,' he added, 'I don't think you will find that the English lawyers have realized that there are any serious psychological difficulties; they don't need to, as you can generally shunt really difficult questions on to the jury.' I understood my friend's statement when I looked up Stephen's *History of the Criminal Law in England*. . . . Our modern lawyers, finding that Benthamism as expounded and simplified by Austin and Stephen is both easy to learn and easy to reproduce in professional examinations or in Court, have been satisfied with it ever since."

The very means which government selected—licensing through

examination—have widely failed to assure the professions and the community of adequate personnel for the professional services. This result is not capricious; it is not esoteric in its import. Those who know examinations best are generally more cautious about their accomplishments than those who look upon them from a layman's standpoint. All too commonly those attributes of the person which are easiest and most confidently tested on paper are those which fundamentally are of the least concern to the public as well as to those who are deeply concerned about professional practice.

So, that aspect of professionalism which involves ethical standards of practice too often is bypassed in favor of factual knowledge and skill. Such an attribute as "integrity," for example, may not fare very well on a paper examination. Despite examinations, it may be true of some lawyers, as Trollope too harshly put it in *Orley Farm*, that "no amount of eloquence will make an English lawyer think that loyalty to truth should come before loyalty to his client." But "integrity" is still an important ingredient in the makeup of any professional person today, even though tests may not adequately divine its presence or absence. Its significance is pointed out clearly in the epitaph of an eighteenth-century clockmaker: "Here lies in a horizontal position the outside case of George Roughleigh, watchmaker, whose abilities in that line were an honor to his profession. Integrity was the mainspring and Prudence the Regulator of all the Actions of his Life."

In the achievement of such a virtue as "integrity" something more than general altruism is required. Even the craftsman's legitimate pride in his product is not sufficient. Professional ethics, to be genuine and effective, needs the underpinning of general ethical theory and the personal commitment of the practitioner through a sense of vocation that rests finally in the God who has revealed himself in Jesus Christ, the master workman.

One part of the present problem of professionalism requires a re-examination of the role of the individual in his work—his sense of vocation. The widely prevailing view of the vocational motivations of individuals asserts their interest in obtaining life satisfactions from work and of making some contribution to the community. Thus, the individual himself becomes one of the two main standards by which

work activities may be judged. The community, usually to a lesser extent, is also recognized. No one, of course, would deny the importance of the individual's securing work which would prove personally satisfying. But some might have questions to raise about the definition of what is personally satisfying. In what sense can personally satisfying conditions of work be created for individuals without an awareness on their part of the relevant universal goals toward which their work is oriented? Is not happiness a by-product which comes to individuals when other conditions, such as the successful achievement of responsibilities, have been fulfilled? In a spiritually based society, can happiness be achieved without reference to that content which gives the spiritual its foundation? In other words, how possible is it to adjure vocational happiness or fulfillment without a recognition of the involvement of God in individual life?

As Henry Pitney Van Dusen points out convincingly in *God and These Times,* God must be the most significant factor in life or he does not genuinely exist at all for the individual. One cannot compartmentalize God and claim that he is important within the churches but not a sufficient guide for the choice of a life's work and for its joyous execution. As the Gospel of John affirms, "I have chosen you, and appointed you that you should go forth and bring forth fruit." The notion that a man does not choose his vocation, but has it imposed upon him by God, does not rest well with the impatient and independent spirits of our age. On the other hand, it may be no less relevant and psychologically sound. By any standard, one of the acknowledged deficiencies both in many programs of vocational guidance and of education is the lack of the sense of vocation as connoting the individual's ability to relate his work to "some governing purpose or meaning in things."

To assert, as has been done, that the revival of acknowledged purpose in work, which is related to broad and transpersonal aims, is a deep-seated need in our times does not claim that this sense of vocationalism would necessarily solve any or all of our individual or societal problems connected with work. In fact, the acceptance of such a view merely raises many questions about work. By what means does the worker relate his spiritual commitments to his work-a-day activities? Can it be believed that all sorts of vocations bear the im-

print of the divine or is there need to reconsider the social and the spiritual values of such activities? What might be the role of the churches in bringing about a renewed sense of spiritual vocation and what might they do to strengthen Christian professionals in their efforts to maintain the now seemingly tenuous relation between God and work? Yet, despite the many problems inherent in accepting a spiritual conception of professional responsibility and individual development through work, there fortunately are many today who are willing to consider the idea with open minds and there are some who are seeking to know and to follow the will of God in their work.

Another aspect of the problem of professionalism in our times which merits careful thought is the need for a re-examination of the role of the community in professional activities. Vocational guidance, like other features of society in the West, has been dominated by individualism. But individualism in its extreme form negates the individual. Extreme individualism says, as Dickens has Betsey Prig say in *Martin Chuzzlewit* to Mrs. Harris about another character, "Bother—there's no sich a person." Individualism can only exist successfully within community, and in fact it takes a highly developed form of community to permit and maintain individualism to any extent. Thus the individualism of Jeremiah built upon the community of Moses.

Fortunately, there is reason to believe that there is a renewal of the sense of community in several parts of the world. The descriptions of "communities of work" in France, such as that of the Boimondeau company, one of the largest manufacturers of watch cases in France, in Claire H. Bishop's helpful book *All Things Common,* give a basis for hope that work may be reoriented from a merely personal and self-centered activity to a socially and spiritually productive "calling."

In America the revival of the sense of the community is becoming a significant factor in national life. Harry W. Schacter, for example, has reported on local renewal in Kentucky in *Kentucky on the March.* Richard W. Posten tells how local communities in Montana have succeeded in this direction in *Small Town Renaissance.* Many other descriptions have told how America is moving to a fresh awareness of the possibilities of community.

The questions which the professional person raises in connection

with his acceptance of a sense of vocation may be "answered" in part through the development of an adequate expression of community. By democratic means, inspired by the obligation of men to express the will of God in all their relations with each other, a community may be able to provide some "answers" to individual dilemmas.

The communal relations of the professional person especially come into focus when the role of the churches in society is considered. Although it may not be entirely clear what relations should exist between working groups and the churches, the community of Christian workers, as expressed in part in the relations of Christian with Christian in the churches, enlightens the present task. If the churches are the model of the coming Kingdom for which men hope, they must provide, in their collective lives, a reason and support for the work which their members perform outside of the churches. In fact, they well might become the grounds on which fertile discussions are held among Christian professionals and other workers regarding their special problems and aspirations.

In this connection it is heartening to note that the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches selected "The Laity—the Christian in his Vocation" as a "subsidiary theme." Indeed, as with the other secondary themes of the Assembly, "the Christian hope" becomes translucent and vital when it is considered not only in abstract theological terms, but as an integral part of the everyday life of Christian men. If Christ is our hope, as he is, then he is our hope for the solution of the rising problem of professionalism. His sense of the worth of the individual and his election of believers to a life of Christian purposefulness require that professionalism's roots and fruits be reexamined. His conception of the community as the "settlement" of those who cooperatively seek the fulfillment of his Father's Kingdom requires that Christians strive to establish such community in which work becomes not only the fulfillment of personal and communal hopes, but the means by which the plenary purposes of God for human life are achieved. In this spirit the professional, as in Milton's words in "Comus," may find opportunities and satisfactions greater than he ever imagined:

> At last he rose, and twitched his mantle blue:
> Tomorrow to the fresh woods, and pastures new.

Justification and the Discipline of Liturgics

By William Nagel[1]

THE CURRENT efforts to achieve a proper form of worship indicate that what is necessary is a further re-thinking of the rebuilding of the church on the basis of the Bible and the confession of the church. If it is true that "what happens or does not happen in the pulpit and at the altar determines whether a church is still the church of the pure Gospel" (H. Sasse), then we cannot simply be content with the liturgies of the past, as we have been with ways of preaching, education, organization, and so on.

What becomes of even the best liturgical form when it is put into the hands of ministers who lack any standards whatsoever for recognizing the theological decisions that underlie them, to say nothing of judging them objectively? But without this, all criticism of form must remain superficial and irrelevant, no matter whether it is affirmative or negative. How such ministers can ever help their congregations gain an understanding of the liturgy or even of future alterations in its traditional form remains a complete mystery.

All this points up the importance of liturgics in practical theology. But what is most important is the right orientation in an introduction to liturgics. Its real purpose is not as full as possible a description of liturgical forms in the past and the present, nor psychological and sociological observations in the area of liturgics, nor even practical directions for the liturgist. That kind of a presentation might very well lead to the point where later the "experienced" minister may think he can dispense with these things or even feel confirmed in the dangerous error of thinking that his skillful technique in handling his services is in itself a guarantee of its effectiveness in building up the congregation. We need liturgics as the theological theory of the liturgical practice of the church. It must provide the future liturgist with valid standards for the whole complex of liturgical practice. As its center, therefore, there must be a profound view of the essential nature of the service of worship.

And here it has become increasingly clearer to me that this can be gained only within the scope of the particular confession in whose liturgical life one is rooted and for which one feels responsible. There is in fact no such thing as a Christian liturgy in itself, but only liturgies which have grown out of a Lutheran,

1 Translated by John W. Doberstein from an article in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Vol. 79, Number 9 (Sept., 1954). Some omissions of material irrelevant to the American scene have been made.

Reformed, or some other point of view. If the liturgy actually does present the central expression of the life of every Christian church, then it cannot really be surprising that a theology of worship will be determined by the confession which that church holds, that is, for us, Lutheran or Reformed. On the basis of this fundamental orientation, a confessional liturgics will naturally set forth other views of worship. Comparison with other views will aid in examining and testing our own, and perhaps also make it possible to utilize for our own self-understanding the partial truths which have been more clearly wrought out by others. The discipline of liturgics, in its study of the history of worship and its most important types and eras, will bring out the right ways and the wrong ways that liturgical forms have taken. And in the area of contemporary practice it will present a critical consideration of the forms and means of worship and above all the tasks which remain to be done.

With this brief sketch of the reasons for an intensified study of liturgics and the form it should take as the theological theory of liturgical practice, I should like in what follows to show to what extent the article of justification assumes peculiar significance for the development of liturgics in the sense that I have indicated.

Liturgics can gain the character of a valid theological discipline only if it succeeds in developing its field of knowledge beyond a multiplicity of isolated observations, facts, and aims into a whole that is complete in itself. To this end it must have an objective claim to present, based on definite, fundamental principles, and apply this as an evaluating and organizing standard to all the varied objects of liturgical study. This possession of fundamental principles, which serve as the starting-point and standard of judgment, liturgics shares with all theological science, and not only theological science. This can surprise only those who still think they can hold on to the myth of a presuppositionless science and the universal validity of scientific judgments. In reality we today operate in every science with primary decisions and certain "pre-judgments"; only in the course of the research process itself does their usefulness or uselessness become apparent in the extent to which they help to join together the multiplicity of isolated facts into a meaningful whole.

I have already suggested what seems to me to be the only possible presupposition for a theological discipline of liturgics. In my conviction it is given in the fact that the actual liturgical practice of the church is always confessionally determined, consciously or unconsciously. Therefore, for one who recognizes that in his liturgical work he is bound to the Lutheran confession, the basic presupposition or the guiding principle of liturgics will be the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae,* the article of justification *sola fide propter Christum.* In it, according to Lutheran understanding, is concentrated the whole Gospel, and Luther therefore calls it the *"magister, princeps, dominus, rector, judex super*

omnia genera doctrinarum, qui conservat et gubernat omnen doctrinam ecclesiasticam."[2]

Briefly summarized, this is its substance. The subject of justification is not man but God alone. We are all at the mercy of his judgment. It is impossible to protest against the judgment that makes us all sinners. There is nothing we can do but surrender unconditionally to God's dealing with us, wait and hear what God intends to do with us, unless instead we choose to remain obdurate in unbelief. But this listening to God may be transformed in receptive faith as God addresses to the hopeless, speechless sinner his paradoxical judgment, which is life instead of death, mercy instead of justice, acceptance instead of condemnation. And yet the assurance of this total promise, which requires no supplementation whatsoever, depends only on faith, which as it hears the message of the historical revelation of God in Christ accepts it and is first aroused in that very hearing of the message, the faith that through Christ's cross and resurrection sin, including our personal sin, is judged and vanquished.

Even though this action of God will produce visible effects in life, it is always only the *aliena justitia* of God that restores and sustains our relationship to God. Therefore this message of *Christus pro nobis* must always be proclaimed in its integrity, uncurtailed and undiluted, and only so can it be believed; and only in so far as the church adheres to this Word does it have any promise that the vitalizing powers of the Gospel can come to realization in its worship and its life.

How, then, can this doctrine, accepted as the fundamental presupposition of Lutheran liturgics, become at the same time a fruitful principle for its construction?

In the first place, the article of justification will prove itself as the *critical principle* of liturgical work. Because God's act of reconciliation is effectual for us only as we allow ourselves to be reconciled and this offer of reconciliation comes to us only as the Creator-Spirit works faith in us, this doctrine will be a check to human power in every form. This means that Lutheran liturgics must give to God's action for us the primary place in whatever happens in worship and thus put in first place the Word and sacraments as the *means of grace*. On this basis, then, it must make clear to those who conduct the service the tremendous responsibility which has been laid upon them by reason of the fact that God has chosen to make their preaching and administration of the sacraments the "masks and veils" (*larvae et involucra,* as Luther called them) of his action upon the congregation. In this connection it would also deal with the congregation's part in the service of proclamation, according to the universal priesthood, as this takes place above all in the hymns which it sings. Here we see why it is so important to have the strictest standards in the selection of hymns for our

2 Disputation of Peter Palladius and Tilemann, 1537, *WA,* 39, 1, 205.

hymnals. Lutheran liturgics will at the same time have to oppose all liturgical forms in which man attempts forcibly to influence God. The response of the congregation to the Word of God can only take place in acts of *eucharistia* (thanksgiving), which overflow in immeasurable fullness only when the message of justification is heard in faith. In the discussion of the forms in which human *eucharistia* is expressed, from prayers and hymns of the congregation to music, paraments, and architecture, liturgics will have to emphasize again and again the fact that in the Nicene Creed the words "I believe in the remission of sins" and "I believe in the Holy Spirit, the lord and giver of life" occur together of necessity in one and the same article. Indeed, it should show that when the liturgy makes use of the arts as means of expression, either for the purposes of *eucharistia* or proclamation, this divests these means of their autonomous power in order to endow them with new creative possibilities.

Having indicated the strength of the article of justification when applied as a principle of criticism at a number of important points, we may also recognize that it can also become the *dynamic principle* of liturgics. On the one hand, when we start with this article we see that the service of worship is the place where our hearing of the Gospel becomes believing, and believing becomes a receiving of the fruits of Christ's saving work. For Lutherans, therefore, the service of worship has saving significance, and we can never lay too much emphasis upon it. On the other hand, because as sinners we daily need justifying grace, we cannot claim absolute validity for any order constructed by us men. Never can the use of any of our liturgical orders justify us before God. All liturgical orders are relative on principle. Nevertheless, this cannot mean that we can dispense with liturgical order or dismiss it as a trifle. The worship of God "in spirit and in truth," which has no need for any order whatsoever, is something that will be possible only in the *eschaton*. Therefore, since we need the ordered service of worship for our salvation, and yet are forbidden to make any order absolute, Lutheran liturgics will have within it the impulse to unceasing self-criticism. It must constantly be testing to see to what extent its insights and the form they are given conform to the essence of Lutheran worship of God. At the same time, it must take account of the real situation as it obtains in the world and consider the question whether the liturgical forms in current use are still capable in the present of promoting the purpose of Lutheran worship, namely, of edifying the congregation and also drawing people from outside into the Gospel's sphere of action. Particularly in this latter connection will the dynamic of faith in justification guard us against being content with tradition and impel us to consider new forms.

The article of justification brings this element of wholesome unrest into our liturgical work from still another direction. Because in this doctrine the assurance of reconciliation is set forth as a personal experience, it is also the point

that marks the meeting of the historically mediated revelation with the faith which appropriates it individually. Therefore, a liturgics which makes this article its fundamental assumption and working principle will not be able, either in its systematic theory or in liturgical construction, simply to conserve and hand down an objective form for that central truth. On the contrary, both in doctrine and liturgy it must strive for forms which are capable of interpreting this all-sustaining truth for the present time. And to do this it will be necessary to examine ways of learning and communicating and forms of working which have been developed at a particular time in order to see to what extent these may contribute to the "embodiment" of the Gospel in that particular time or how they may be adapted to make them serve this purpose. This is the only way in which we can take account of the real life, the historical existence, of people, and only so can a man's physical, somatic hearing of the faith-creating Word become "understanding" of that Word and from it come an acceptance of the Word.

This leads us to another implication of the article of justification for the evangelical service of worship: the absolute necessity of building a bridge between the historically transmitted form of the divine Word and man's situation today in the form of a sermon, address, or at least a summary. The fact is that free preaching has peculiar potentialities for clearing away rationalistic obstacles to an encounter with the Word and for making the hearers aware of the place that particular truths of revelation have in their actual life. The article of justification would therefore veto the kind of service which includes long readings from Luther's Bible [or the King James version], whose language has long since grown strange to our people, and long recitations of the Psalms, and then shirks the task of providing a helpful exposition, be it ever so brief.

On the other hand, however, starting with the article of justification will also prevent the sermon from becoming an absolute in the service. For Lutheranism, preaching is not the self-presentation of a believing individual nor the faith of the congregation expressing itself, to which all the other elements of the liturgical action are subordinated. In the Lutheran service of worship the sermon becomes, I might almost say, a "sacramental act." The deepest purpose in the sermon is that God's creative Word shall become effectual in, with, and under our paltry human words. The Lutheran understanding of justification will stifle the preacher's human *hybris* but strengthen his believing boldness to venture as ambassadors for God in Christ's stead, to declare the Word which God promised should not return void. Having this consciousness that preaching has the character of a commission, the preacher will be willing to let the liturgy of the particular Sunday or festival, especially its pericopes, tell him which note of all the riches of the Gospel should be sounded at this time in the congregation. Hence, Lutheran liturgics will also be obliged to be very seriously concerned with the

church year. But since God's Word, preached in this "sacramental" sense, is communicated only in the dimension of prayerful turning to God, and only so can be rightly heard, for Lutherans the sermon and the liturgy constitute a necessary and inseparable whole. Practically speaking, the result of this in the structure of liturgics will be that the fundamental principles of homiletics will have to be previously discussed within the framework of liturgics. Homiletics as a separate discipline exists only because of the impossibility of loading liturgics with the multiplicity of practical problems of form involved in free preaching.

I have attempted to show the critical and dynamic import of the article of justification in several of the problems that touch the essence of the service of worship. I should like briefly at least to indicate how the treatment of problems in the history of liturgy and the future tasks of liturgical study can be deepened and brought closer to resolution by the principle of the Lutheran understanding of justification. I take, for example, the problem of Luther's retention of the scheme of the mass. This has often been looked upon, in contrast with Zwingli's liturgical work, as merely a sign of Luther's liturgical incapacity. But when Luther, in contrast with the Reformed view, recognized the service's function of calling forth and creating faith, then for the Lutheran Reformation it became a matter of vital importance to make the tremendous responsibility of human proclamation more bearable by leaving room in the service for regular provision of both forms of the action of divine grace, that of preaching and that of the sacrament. At the same time each of these forms, in this immediate juxtaposition, helps to guard the other from possible misunderstandings of its meaning (such as, preaching being the self-expression of an individual believer or the sacrament a magical act). On the other hand, the man who lives by justification through God's grace will of necessity be very mistrustful of any self-contrived liturgical originality. Can he ever be quite sure, then, whether it is really the Holy Spirit or only his own or the spirit of the time which is prompting him? At the same time the justified man knows that he has been incorporated in the church of God of all times, so that from this point of view, too, though there is necessity for evangelical criticism of the traditional forms, there is no necessity for a completely new, original creation. This example is perhaps in itself an indication of how this kind of "evaluative" treatment of historical liturgical problems can make them immediately fruitful for the tasks of the present.

We have room only briefly to point out another example: the history of the canon of the mass (in the narrower sense of the term). It is well known that efforts are being made to restore the so-called "high prayer" to the Lutheran "mass." It is true that there is an amazingly extensive tradition that can be adduced for this element. And yet anybody whom the *sola fide* of the Reformation has made mistrustful of any and every form of pious activism in the appropriation of salvation will look very critically upon this embedding of the *verba testamenti*,

in which the Lord himself bestows the Supper's gift of grace upon us, in a profusion of human prayer-action. And if, beyond this, one observes that it is precisely in the early days of Christianity that we can document definite connections between the Christian Supper and the celebration of the epiphany of a dying and rising god in the mystery religions of late antiquity,[3] and that it is precisely the eucharistic prayer which is so closely related to those hymnic mystery prayers by which the epiphany of the god was invoked, then the retention of the "bareness" of the Lutheran communion office becomes a very fundamental decision. It was here that the Reformer, with that inner sureness that comes from a faith nourished by the Word of divine forgiveness, even though he did not possess our historical knowledge, pushed aside what could be intended as human influence exerted to bring about the sacramental effect in order to give the central and solitary place to the words in which the Lord himself pledged his grace-giving presence in the observance of the sacrament of the altar. It is the Reformation *sola fide* that prompts us to be on guard against every revival of the idea of sacrifice in the Lord's Supper in any form, beyond the "sacrifice of thanksgiving," that tends to rely upon the possibility of exerting human influence upon God.

In conclusion I can merely touch upon the importance of the article of justification for the liturgical tasks of the future, which a scientific liturgics cannot evade pointing out. I have already said that when we start with the article of justification it becomes impossible to set up any liturgical forms as absolute, whether they be new forms of service or individual vehicles of liturgical form, such as Gregorian chant. The consequence is that real cooperation with one anothers in the forming of the Lutheran service and further development of the liturgical tradition are made possible, which means at the same time a form of liturgical work which has a sympathetic regard for the congregation, and yet does not allow itself to be enslaved by congregational custom, because it seeks for new forms only for the welfare of the congregation. Yet all our work on the liturgy will not give us a good conscience before God inasmuch as we can never consider it finished.

Liturgical work on the foundation of *sola fide* will have only one absolute: the means of grace, the Word and the sacraments. Those who teach liturgics will regard it as their central task to see to it that these means of grace shall again be set forth in all their God-given fullness in the Lutheran service, and they will have to point out again and again to future ministers of the church the centrality of this obligation as well as how it is to be given expression. Not until practical theology really makes it one of its central tasks thus to develop Lutheran liturgics into a discipline that sets norms, and teaches what other con-

3 Cf. G. P. Wetter, *Altchristliche Liturgien*, 1921, pp. 53 ff., 188, 169 ff.

fessions may do according to their principles as such, will the real center of the ministry cease to be overlaid by the multitude of other claims upon the pastor's practical activity. Lutheran liturgics, permeated by the salutary meaning of the service of worship (in accord with Article V of the Augsburg Confession),[4] will rather claim the best time and strength and devotion of the minister for his liturgical activity, for, as the Pomeranian *Kirchenordnung* of 1569 declares:

> Since Almighty God upholds his Christian church on earth through this public ministry or office of the church in the assembly of the congregation through the teaching and preaching of the Gospel, through the administration of the holy sacraments and the ministration of the holy, godly offices of the church, through Christian songs, prayer, ceremonies and the like, . . . so also the Lord God wills that he be honored, worshiped, lauded, and praised by us men in the assembly of the congregation. . . . Therefore, where the Word of God is preached, sung, read, and prayed, there the Lord God is mightily present with his holy angels, that as we, with all angels and spirits of God, sing praise to the name of the Lord, there the Son of God works through his Word and godly songs in god-loving hearts, as Christ says: Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them. And again, What they ask will be done for them. Matthew 18.[5]

4 "For the obtaining of this faith, the ministry of teaching the Gospel and administering the sacraments was instituted."

5 Sehling, *Kirchenordnungen,* IV, p. 434.

William Frederick Lehmann

By P. H. Buehring

THE FINEST product of the Columbus Seminary of the former Joint Synod of Ohio under the administration of its first professor, Wilhelm Schmidt,[1] in fact, the man who far overshadowed his teacher in importance and influence, was William Frederick Lehmann. It is interesting to note in passing that both were natives of the same German state. Lehmann was born October 16, 1820, in Markkroeningen, Wuerttemberg, where his father followed the coppersmith's trade, apparently with rather indifferent success. When little William was four years old, his father took his wife and children to America and settled in Philadelphia. Here the boy attended the parish school of St. Michael's Church, where the well known composer and publisher of church music, J. G. Schmauk, was his teacher. It was Schmauk, who together with the pastors of St. Michael's, Dr. C. R. Demme and the Rev. E. E. Peixoto, observed the fine intellectual gifts and spiritual qualifications of the lad, induced him to choose the ministry as his vocation, gave him special instruction, and finally sent him off to Columbus after his confirmation in his fifteenth year. Ten days later the boy arrived by stage coach in the little capital city of Ohio and was warmly welcomed by Professor Schmidt, who himself had left Philadelphia only seven or eight years before.

Lehmann was without doubt one of the youngest students ever to enter the seminary in Columbus. Barely fifteen years old, he soon found a friend and adviser in a young man ten years his senior, Christian Spielmann, who was completing his seminary course that year. Both were poor as churchmice, so they and four other students, equally poor, undertook to prepare their own meals in the basement of the seminary building, at an average cost for each of them, as Spielmann much later remembered, of 49 cents a week; and they slept in the unfinished, unheated upper story, Lehmann and Spielmann in a straw-tick on the floor because they had no bed. "But," says Spielmann, "God graciously gave us good health, a joyful and contented heart, and diligence in our studies."

Four years later, in the spring of 1839, Lehmann completed Schmidt's curriculum in languages and theology and was licensed as a "candidate" by the Ohio Synod. However, still being less than nineteen years old, he did not at once enter the ministry but returned to Philadelphia for further study. His

1 See the November, 1955, issue of this periodical for a biographical sketch of Wilhelm Schmidt.

friends sent him to the Gettysburg Seminary, where the famous Dr. S. S. Schmucker was teaching his students "American Lutheranism," but he came back after a few weeks thoroughly dissatisfied with what he found there. He now studied privately under the direction of Dr. Demme and Pastor G. A. Reichert, both scholarly men, working especially in Hebrew and Old Testament, and he eked out a living by working as an agent of a local Bible society.

The next year, 1840, he returned to Ohio, had his license renewed for another year, and was assigned to a parish of eight congregations in Fairfield county with headquarters in Lancaster (about 30 miles from Columbus). He served this widely scattered parish with great zeal and faithfulness, though with some interruptions, for three years. His license was renewed in 1841 and again in 1842, and he was ordained in June, 1843, when he became Pastor Spielmann's successor in the Perry county parish of some five or six congregations centering in Somerset, Ohio, the county seat. Later, as seminary professor, in his classes in Pastoral Theology, he loved to tell his students about his experiences in those days: his long travels on horseback over roads that were little more than trails over the hills and through the forests; the physical exertions; the poverty of the pastor and his flock; life in the log cabins and worship in little log churches, etc. One of his favorite stories was about the conversion of a 90-year-old Pennsylvania-Dutchman, whom he rescued from the jaws of Satan on the very brink of the grave.

The high regard in which the young man was held even at that time by his brethren, and their confidence in his abilities, are illustrated by the fact that in May, 1842, when the seminary was in one of its perennial financial difficulties, the board sent young Lehmann—not yet 22 years old!—to the Pennsylvania Synod as its agent to solicit help from the mother synod. He appeared on the floor of the convention, presented his credentials, and was given a respectful and sympathetic hearing. He secured $580 in subscriptions, of which about one-third was paid in cash. He returned to his charge after three months, but in November of the same year the seminary board sent him out again, this time to the congregations of the Ohio Synod in eastern Ohio and western Pennsylvania, where in seven months of "laborious exertion" (so the board reported) he collected over $1,000 in cash and subscriptions.

Meanwhile, after the death of Professor Schmidt in the fall of 1839, various fortunes and misfortunes befell the seminary. In the spring of 1840 a successor to Professor Schmidt was secured in the person of the Rev. C. F. Schaeffer, of Hagerstown, Md., a member of the Maryland Synod; and in the fall of 1842, at long last, a second professor, Frederick Winckler, of Newark, N. J., arrived. The seminary property, too, was considerably improved. The original building was completed by finishing the second story, and in 1842 an additional brick building was erected at a cost of $4,296.72, including equipment, to provide ad-

ditional housing, and a kitchen, dining room, and living quarters for the "steward." In the winter semester, beginning about November 1, the seminary had 21 out-of-town students preparing for the ministry. In fact, the board and the synod were definitely looking forward to the establishment of a regular college, to be known as "Germania College," in connection with the seminary, a project in which the Pennsylvania Synod showed considerable interest.

But even while fortune's sun was thus smiling again upon the young institution, the dark clouds of disaster were gathering on the horizon. Soon after Winckler's arrival, the two professors fell into a violent quarrel with each other, a quarrel in which the student body as well as many pastors in the synod took sides. The details do not concern us here; ostensibly it was over the use of the German language in instruction, but the roots lay much deeper in the strong, highly incompatible personalities of the two men. After repeated efforts to settle the quarrel, the board called for the resignation of both. Schaeffer complied at once and left in June, 1843. Winckler hung on for another year until June, 1844, when the synod reviewed the case and voted to keep him at the seminary. But during the school year 1844-1845 the student body dwindled to a mere handful, and there was widespread dissatisfaction throughout the synod with the handling of the situation. In May, 1845, Winckler was finally dismissed and later joined the Buffalo Synod.

For two years now, from 1845 to 1847, the seminary, to use a phrase of Henry Eyster Jacobs, was "in a state of suspended animation," and voices were heard in favor of closing it altogether. There were no theological professors. During the school year 1845-1846, a language teacher, Mr. C. Jucksch, taught two theological students and four youngsters in the "college" in history, geography, and languages, but he resigned in the fall of 1846, and the school was actually closed entirely until Lehmann revived it in 1847.

Having learned from bitter experience that it is not always wise to "look across the fence" to other synods for suitable material for its theological professorships, the board in the fall of 1856 unanimously elected the young 26-year-old Pastor W. F. Lehmann, a graduate of its own seminary and a loyal member of the Ohio Synod, who despite his youth had already demonstrated unmistakable qualities of leadership, sound theology, and good common sense, and who because of his fairness and good judgment in the hot and angry language dispute enjoyed the confidence of both the pro-German and the anti-German factions in the synod. Pastor Lehmann accepted the call and began to teach a few students in his home in Somerset, Ohio, during the summer semester of 1847. When his six congregations in Perry county finally released him, he moved in October of that year with his 18-year-old wife into the seminary building in Columbus and opened the winter semester in November with some twenty students in the proseminary and the seminary, among them a young man by the

name of Matthias Loy, who later was to become the most outstanding leader of his synod. In his teaching he adhered strictly to the rule laid down by the synod in 1845, that all preseminary students must learn both English and German and that all lectures in the seminary must be delivered in both languages. With inexhaustible energy he addressed himself to his herculean task as the one and only teacher of both the proseminary and the seminary, and so successful was he that in June of the following year, when the Ohio Synod met once again in Columbus, he could risk having his students give a literary entertainment in the new court house, which was received with great enthusiasm by an audience that crowded the court room.

For thirty-three years, from 1847 to December 1, 1880, when he died, Lehmann continued at his post. Space does not permit even a mere enumeration of all the more important happenings of those eventful years. Three times the seminary was moved during Lehmann's administration: in 1850 from South High Street to East Town Street near the heart of the city, where it was combined with Capital University, opened that year; in 1853 from East Town Street to High and Goodale Streets on the then northern outskirts of the city; and again in 1876 from North High Street to East Main Street, its present location. During those three decades Lehmann saw the little one-man school with its handful of students grow into a quite respectable institution housed in an adequate set of buildings and consisting of three divisions, a two-year preparatory department, a four-year college, and a three-year seminary, with a faculty of six full-time men and a student body of eighty. None will ever know how much labor and toil and thought and worry and self-sacrifice Lehmann contributed to that development. In a very real sense it may be said that the institution of 1880 was *his* school, the work of *his* hands, the child of *his* heart. It was he who several times, at the cost of great personal sacrifice, saved the institution from sheer financial bankruptcy. It was he who with a steady hand and a clear mind kept its inner development on an even keel, when optimistic enthusiasts dreamed dreams and saw visions of a grand university with four separate faculties and hundreds of students. But more important still, it was he who strengthened the foundations of sound confessional Lutheranism on which the seminary had been built when the first president of Capital University, Dr. W. M. Reynolds, in 1850 inaugurated policies which endangered those foundations. And finally it was Lehmann who saved the very life of Capital University and its seminary when during the 1870's the Ohio Synod was a member of the Synodical Conference. At that time Dr. C. F. W. Walther, of the Missouri Synod, advanced his grandiose scheme of "state synods" with a complete reorganization of the educational system of the constituent bodies, involving the removal of the Ohio Synod's college to Pittsburgh and the merging of its seminary with Concordia in St. Louis. For it was Lehmann who advised his brethren in the Ohio Synod to go a bit more slowly in

their enthusiasm for Walther's scheme and to await further developments—a policy the wisdom of which was amply demonstrated only a few years later when the Ohio Synod withdrew from the Synodical Conference over the predestination controversy.

It would seem that a theological professorship alone would have been enough to require all the time and strength of even so talented and energetic a man as William Lehmann, particularly since for the first eighteen years, down to 1865, when Loy became his assistant, he was the one and only professor in the seminary. But his brethren in the Ohio Synod did not think so. Rather they believed that "the willing horse should carry the heaviest load," and so they piled one duty and responsibility after another upon the willing shoulders of Professor Lehmann, so that it almost seems a miracle of God's grace that he did not collapse much earlier than he did. In 1857, after the debacle of President Reynolds, the presidency of Capital University was forced upon him and he held it until he died. At the same time, while teaching all the classes in the seminary, he also taught German and Hebrew, and sometimes Latin, and perhaps other subjects, in the college. When he took over the seminary in 1847 he also became pastor of Trinity Church in Columbus, which during his pastorate of a quarter of a century grew into a large and flourishing congregation. At the same time he also organized an English Lutheran congregation and served it for several years. And in 1878, after Capital University had moved to its present location on East Main Street, Lehmann gathered the Lutherans in the neighborhood and organized Christ Church, remaining its pastor until he died.

In the synod at large, Lehmann held almost innumerable positions and appointments, and it would take us far afield even to list them here. In 1860 the German church paper of the Ohio Synod, *Die lutherische Kirchenzeitung,* was launched, and Lehmann was its editor for twenty years, until he died. He was president of the Ohio Synod, and also of its Western District, several times for terms of a number of years. He served on innumerable synodical committees, such as the committee on an English hymnal, a German hymnal, an English liturgy, on secret societies, etc. From 1845 to 1848 he was business manager and expediter of *The Lutheran Standard.* In 1872 he helped to organize the Synodical Conference and became its first vice-president. The next year he was elected its president, and he held that office several times during the subsequent years. Here, for example, is what Lehmann was in 1878: (1) president of Capital University, (2) professor of theology and dean of the seminary, (3) professor of German and Hebrew in the college, (4) treasurer of the building fund of Capital University, (5) president of the Western District of the Ohio Synod, (6) editor of the *Lutherische Kirchenzeitung,* (7) president of the Synodical Conference, (8) pastor of Christ Church. There never was another man

in the entire history of the Ohio Synod who held so many positions in the church and filled them all so well as Professor William F. Lehmann.[2]

Lehmann possessed a rugged constitution and enjoyed excellent health. Of medium height, he probably did not carry a single pound of excess fat on his spare frame. His bearing was erect, his eyes sparkled, his face was framed with a truly patriarchal beard that flowed down over his broad chest and only partially concealed the sly smile that ofen played around his lips. Like many gentlemen of that period, both in church and state, he was fond of chewing tobacco.

Lehmann made a profound and lasting impression, almost at first sight, upon all individuals with whom he came in contact. Dr. E. Gerfen, who was personally known to the writer and passed away at a very ripe old age not many years ago, came to Capital University from Concordia College, Ft. Wayne, Ind., in 1877. Fifty-three years later he described his first meeting with Lehmann as follows:

> When I saw him, I was amazed at his personal appearance. His strong, sturdy, though not unusually large figure, his well-shaped head above his broad shoulders, his high intellectual forehead, his broad, long, patriarchal beard, his kindly shining eyes and his gently smiling mouth —all this made an indelible impression on me. Such an imposing, awe-inspiring personality I had never seen before.

Dr. William Schmidt of St. Paul-Luther College, who entered Capital University in 1872 as a young immigrant from Hermannsburg, Germany, wrote in 1918: "Two things I remember vividly from my first interview with Professor Lehmann, his heart-warming friendliness and his patriarchal beard." And four years later, in a personal letter to the author, he wrote: "The first fifteen minutes I spent in Professor Lehmann's presence filled me with free American air for life. Used to the stern German pedagogues as I was, his genial manner, his fine humor, his great kindness, won my heart."

If one were to name what seem to have been the outstanding traits in the character of this remarkable man, these would probably be, first his friendliness, second his dignity, and third his gentle sense of humor. He was easily approachable to anyone, student or professor, layman or pastor, friend or stranger. His sympathetic nature invited confidence, and he never abused it. Students consulted him on intimate personal problems (they called him the "walking encyclopedia"), pastors asked for confidential advice, his parishioners in Trinity Church, poor and humble folk that most of them were, loved him because he was always ready to

2 The only committee assignment I could find that Professor Lehmann did not carry out in person was the delivery by him and Professor Loy of the diploma for the Th.D. degree which Capital University conferred upon Professor C. F. W. Walther in St. Louis in 1877. Instead of delivering this diploma to the great leader of confessional Lutheranism personally, they wrapped it up and mailed it to a pastor in St. Louis with a letter asking him to deliver it to Walther together with the congratulatory message which they had written.

lend a patient ear when they came to him with their troubles. Lehmann was one of those rare individuals in whose character the friendliness of an extrovert and the dignity and reserve of an introvert are in happy combination, and in whom the tensions of both are dissolved in a gentle sense of humor. In his classes he was fond of illustrating a point by telling some humorous anecdote, usually from his pastoral experience in the early years of his ministry. His complete mastery of the quaint Pennsylvania-German dialect added much to the effectiveness of the story.

Lehmann's work as a professor was handicapped not only by the fact that he carried a teaching load that, measured by modern standards, was far too heavy, but also by the great variety of intellectual and scholastic qualifications of his students. There were always only a few who had completed the entire college curriculum; some had come directly from the farm or the carpenter's bench or the cobbler's shop. Some understood little or no English, others there were whose knowledge of German was sadly deficient. But Lehmann was a highly gifted teacher who knew how to bring the subject down to the level of the less gifted student and at the same time keep the more advanced interested in it. One of his former students, who later rose to positions of great importance in the synod, wrote many years after Lehmann's death:

> As we survey the services of our several classmates in the vineyard of the Lord, we find that practically all of them labored successfully, in fact, in more than one case those who had a more scanty preparation with greater success than those who were better prepared. Next to God, the credit for this goes to that servant who understood so well how to communicate to each one of his students that which made him fit for the ministry of the Word.

We have already mentioned the fact that for over twenty-five years Lehmann was the pastor of Trinity congregation in Columbus. When he took over the congregation in 1847 it was a mixture of Lutheran and Reformed and liberal Protestant elements. Under his administration the discordant elements were soon eliminated and the congregation was reorganized on a strictly Lutheran confessional basis. Despite the fact that the multiplicity of his other duties often necessitated his absence from the pulpit and limited his other ministerial functions to the mere essentials, the relationship between pastor and people remained throughout a harmonious and cordial one, and it was with great reluctance and the shedding of many tears that the congregation finally, in 1873, yielded to the insistent request of the seminary board and the synod to release him.

In the pulpit Lehmann was not noted for any oratorical brilliance. In fact, as a young man just entering the ministry, it seems that he was rather slavishly bound to his manuscript, until the kindly criticism of an honest old Pennsylvania-Dutchman shocked him so that he broke with the habit entirely and never

carried anything into the pulpit but a brief outline.[3] In his delivery he followed the rule he consistently drilled into his students: "Langsam, laut und deutlich!" (Slow, loud, and clear.) He had a pleasing voice; his diction, bearing, and action both before the altar and in the pulpit were always deliberate and dignified, yet entirely natural. As a rule he preached on the Gospel selections of the ancient church, and his sermons were simple expositions and applications of the text. But his students admired them so much that they made a habit of jotting down his theme and parts in their notebooks. One of his former students (1866-1868) nearly fifty years later published a number of them in the *Kirchenzeitung*.

Much of Professor Lehmann's time was taken up by his duties as editor of the *Lutherische Kirchenzeitung,* a post which he held from the time its first number appeared on January 1, 1860, until he died on December 1, 1880. The paper appeared on the first and fifteenth of each month, and Lehmann was responsible for all of its contents except the church news, which were edited by his assistant, Professor Emanuel Schmid. A check of his editorial columns reveals Lehmann as a consistent and determined defender of Lutheran principles and practices and a fearless contender against every wrong in faith and life. His polemics against the Buffalo Synod, the General Synod, the General Council, and the Missouri Synod (the latter up to 1868, when Ohio and Missouri established church fellowship), as well as against the United Brethren, the Methodists, and other groups were sharp, sometimes bitter. He had a special grudge against Dr. W. M. Reynolds, the first president of Capital University, and also against several ex-members of the Joint Synod who had gone over to the Roman Catholic Church. He was a consistent advocate of the separation of church and state; but that did not prevent him from throwing the searchlight of God's Word on some of the political and social questions of the day. He strongly supported the Union cause during the Civil War, though he did consider slavery as a purely "political" issue; he defended the infliction of the death penalty on some of the conspirators responsible for Lincoln's assassination; he regularly published and commented on presidential and gubernatorial proclamations. He was a good,

3 One of his favorite stories in his Homiletics classes was about the time he preached his first sermon in a mission in Pomeroy, Ohio, where he organized the St. Paul's congregation while he was serving his first parish in and around Lancaster. Following the practice of many eastern pastors, especially the English, he had taken his sermon manuscript along into the pulpit. After the service an old Pennsylvania-German came up and said to him: "Du, Parra, i denk du brauchst nimmer kumma, du giebst dein Lebtag kei Parra; lese koenne mer selver." (Say, Pastor, I guess you don't need to come back again, you will never be a pastor as long as you live; reading we can do ourselves.) Of course, that irritated the energetic young preacher, and when he returned to the same place four weeks later, he used neither a hymnal nor an altar book nor anything but the Bible in the pulpit; he recited everything from memory, even his sermon. His old rough-spoken friend was there again, and after the service he patted him on the shoulder and said: "Du, Parra, i glaub du giebscht doch noch a Parra." (Say, Pastor, I believe you will make a pastor after all.)

loyal, patriotic American as well as a pastor, professor, and church leader. Occasionally one can even catch a glimpse of his gentle humor in his editorials—for example, when he describes his woes and miseries due to his wife's housecleaning proclivities; or when he tells of his and other pastors' troubles in catching an Ohio river steamboat at Pomeroy on their way to a Western District meeting; or again when from his editorial chair he surveys the chaos and confusion incidental to his removal from his former residence at 56 East Friend (now East Main) Street to his new home opposite Capital University. Never has the *Kirchenzeitung* had a more human and at the same time a more effective editor than William F. Lehmann.

It was through the columns of the *Kirchenzeitung* as well as in his various positions as theological professor, president of Capital University, president of the Western District and of the Joint Synod of Ohio, and finally as president of the Synodical Conference, that Lehmann had the opportunity and the responsibility of exercising the functions of church leadership. Lehmann had the gifts of leadership to a remarkable degree: a logical mind, a strong will, a calm and deliberate poise, sound principles, a definite policy, plus the ability to present his cause in simple, clear, and convincing argument. He never attained the reputation of being a profound and eminent theologian; his synod saw to that by overloading him with work. But Lehmann had a deep and abiding love for God's Word and the Lutheran Confessions; he knew the truth and could distinguish it from error. And it was under his leadership, from the time he became the seminary professor in 1847—hardly twenty-seven years old—until his death thirty-three years later, that the Joint Synod of Ohio threw off the last vestiges of un-Lutheran doctrines and practices which it had inherited from its mother synod and began to take its place among the conservative, confessional Lutheran synods of this country.

In Vol. I, No. 1 of the *Kirchenzeitung,* January 1, 1860, Lehmann in a preface stated the editorial policy he proposed to follow in editing this official organ of the Ohio Synod. In this editorial, unintentionally and quite unconsciously, he at the same time outlined the policy he pursued as the acknowledged leader of the synod.

> With God's help it [the *Kirchenzeitung*] will stand for the confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, without reservation or exception. It will have nothing to do with the so-called Union and with unionism, but to throw light upon it and to combat it. It will not flirt with any false tendency, just as little as it will make a hobby of any peculiarity or favorite idea; but it will simply and clearly propagate and promote the teachings of all our Symbols as well as it knows how, because it holds them to be the correct presentation of Scripture teaching. . . . It will not advocate any practice that may contradict our confession or the Word of God; but it is convinced that Christian discipline should be more akin to the gentle and yet serious mind of our Grand Shepherd than to that of the Old Testament policeman. It is to be more like the gentle shepherd's staff of Christ than the mighty rod of Moses; and

yet, when necessary, it will be stern also, for God's Word is Law, too, and as such must certainly also be used for chastisement. In doing this we shall neither seek nor shy away from battle. The Ohio Synod stands on its own feet. It has a conviction, a church-consciousness, and this, we hope, will soon become apparent in its official paper to all those who are prone to deny its Lutheranism, its unity, its serious purpose.

The writer can think of no better way to characterize the spirit of the former Ohio Synod as he personally knew it for more than thirty years before the merger of 1930. And what the Ohio Synod was, it became, under God, to a very large extent under the leadership of William F. Lehmann.

The busy life of this remarkable man of God came to a fitting climax with the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the seminary, June 24, 1880, at which Lehmann delivered the German sermon. It was to be his last public appearance. Immediately following the celebration he became ill with an ulcer on the right side of his lower jaw, which rapidly developed into cancer. The severe pains and miseries resulting from this disease were intensified by a stroke of paralysis that lamed his entire left side. As long as two months before he died it was evident to all, including himself, that there was no hope of recovery. He passed away Wednesday. December 1, 1880, in his home on East Main Street, where the Schenk Divinity Hall now stands. His age was 60 years, 1 month, 14 days.

The funeral service was held in Trinity Church the following Friday. His colleagues, Matthias Loy and Emanuel Schmid, preached the sermons. Messages of condolence were received from many institutions and individuals. Dr. C. F. W. Walther came in person all the way from St. Louis to transmit the brotherly sympathy of the Concordia Seminary faculty and the Missouri Synod. "Missouri proffers the hand of fellowship to Ohio across the coffin of this dear departed brother," he said.

Lehmann's earthly remains were laid to rest in Greenlawn cemetery. To mark his grave his former students erected a fine monument in his memory. "But the finest monument," said one of them, "he erected for himself in the hearts of all of us."

"For You" and "For Many"

By Olof H. Nelson

DOCTRINES must be established on explicit Scripture, not on assumptions and inferences. Luther insists in the Smalcald Articles (Part II, ii, 15), "We have a rule, namely, that the Word of God should frame articles of faith; otherwise no one, not even an angel." This is a fundamental principle of our church, more fundamental than the Lutheran Church's particular mode of presenting the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Luther was sincere and earnest in his study of the Bible, so that "he powerfully and closely reflected it" and became the great Reformer that he was. But sincerity and earnestness are not a guarantee of freedom from error. The Holy Spirit has not since the days of the apostles kept the church, or any part of it, or any individual church leader, free from doctrinal error. I suggest that an error in our teaching is the misinterpretation of the phrases "for you" and "for many."

In determining what the Scriptures actually teach, it is necessary to know their grammar and syntax. Says Robertson in his large grammar, "Exact grammatical knowledge is essential to true interpretation of the New Testament." Luther and the other Reformers stressed the use of Greek grammar in the study of New Testament books. Melanchthon even wrote a textbook on Greek grammar, which from 1518 to 1544 passed through as many as seventeen editions. He declared, "The Scriptures cannot be understood theologically unless they be first understood grammatically." But these Bible scholars did not have the scientific grammatical knowledge that we possess today. Nor did they in their commentaries observe many of the distinctions in New Testament terms which modern conservative scholarship is trying to observe; for instance, the distinctions between flesh and the old man, soul and spirit, flesh and body, *koinonia* and *metechein* in I Cor. 10:16 ff. There are also many differences between the discourse of Jesus in John 6:53 ff. and the words of institution which most commentators have overlooked. With special reference to the Lord's Supper, Dr. M. Reu wrote in 1941: "Every doctrine transmitted to us from the past should be examined again and again [to establish] whether it really is Scriptural or not."

It is to be noted that Matthew and Mark record the words "This is my body" without the words "given for many"; but after "my blood of the covenant" they record the words "which is poured out for many." Instead of "for many" Paul (I Cor. 11) has "for you." According to the longer text in Luke 22:19 ff. Jesus said, "This is my body given for you. . . . This cup is the new covenant in my

blood, even that which is poured for you." These words are omitted in the Revised Standard Version as not having sufficient support in the ancient authorities, and they are therefore placed in a footnote. But though the verse arrangement in the longer text is perplexing, as J. Denney says, and is not according to the original order, the substance was doubtless in the original text. Paul has "This is my body which is broken for you" (RSV), but he omits the phrase "for you" after mention of the blood. "For many" is, in Matthew, *to peri pollon:* literally, "which is concerning many." The preposition *peri* is frequently used, both in the Septuagint and in the New Testament, in connection with a sin-offering (Vaughan on Rom. 8:3). This hidden thought is brought out in the phrase, "unto remission of sins." In Mark we read, "And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them, and they all drank of it. And he said, 'This is the blood of the covenant which is poured out for many,'" Greek *hyper pollon,* i.e., in their behalf, for their benefit, for their salvation. Of these accounts Professor Plummer says in Hastings' Bible Dictionary, "The primary account is that given by Paul; those in Matthew and Mark are virtually one and the same, an account written later than his and independent of it." Luke doubtless received some information on this subject from Paul, but also from others. As a careful historian he "traced the course of all things accurately."

We do not doubt that Jesus uttered both phrases, "for you" and "for many." Mark, who for many years was a companion of Peter, the apostle to the Jews (Gal. 2:7, 8), was later a companion of Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, and was evidently influenced by him not to write his Gospel for the Jews, as one might have expected from his long association with Peter, but "for the Gentile converts to Christianity." "Matthew seems to have had Jewish readers particularly in mind" (Halley). Both Matthew and Mark report the words, "and to give his life a ransom for many," where the Greek has *anti pollon.* Paul's influence on Luke "appears from the stress he lays on the universal mission of Christ" (Purves, *The Apostolic Age*). One might therefore have expected that he, too, would have "for many" instead "for you." We see here the influence of Paul, unless the reading in Luke 22:19, 20 be an interpolation from I Cor. 11 by a later hand. Paul, writing to a local congregation which was seriously affected by factions and want of brotherly love makes a direct appeal to its members to remind them of Christ's love and sacrificial death for them. Hence his use of the words "for you" and the repeated directive of the Lord, "This do in remembrance of me."

The purpose of this article is to compare and contrast Lutheran teaching on Holy Communion with that of the Holy Scriptures. The Formula of Concord declares that "these [Scriptures] alone remain the only judge, rule, and standard according to which, as the only test-stone, all dogmas should and must be discerned and judged."

It becomes necessary to remind ourselves that our Reformers, while hold-

ing to the authority of God's Word, also believed that the early Church Fathers and councils were quite reliable interpreters. Hence they declared that "our churches dissent in no article of the faith from the Church Catholic, or from the Church of Rome, as known from its writers." By the term "Church Catholic" they understood the church of the first five centuries—and perhaps to Gregory the Great (Neve, *Symbolics,* p. 766). And Dr. Schmauk says: "In the Augsburg Confession the Evangelical Protestant development had not yet reached a confession of the formal principle of the Reformation, namely, that the Holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith and life" (*The Confessional Principle,* p. 122). We now know that even the sub-apostolic church (A.D. 100 to 170) deviated from some of the teachings of the New Testament, and especially on the doctrine of Holy Communion. High church leaders taught that the discourse of Jesus in John 6 applies to, and has its fulfillment in, the Lord's Supper. This gave rise to other errors in connection with this sacrament and has resulted in age-long controversies which have not yet been settled.

Our church teaches, as do the Eastern and Roman Churches, that Jesus gave his body and blood *to* the disciples as well as *for* them at the time he instituted the sacrament. But observe the following considerations:

1) Just as the paschal lamb of old had to be sacrificed before they could be eaten in the home, so Jesus as our paschal lamb had to be sacrificed before he could become food for us; not in the Supper, however, but according to his words in John 6.

2) Scriptures tell us that the passover lamb was to be roasted whole; "and they shall eat the flesh thereof that night" (Exod. 12:8). So the body of Christ, all of it, was sacrificed, but only his flesh may be eaten. The analogy argues against our teaching.

3) The word "body" never occurs in the Bible as the object of the verb "to eat." The terms "body" and "flesh" are not interchangeable (against Phillips' translation). Christ as the Son of man *gave* his *body for* us; his *flesh* he *gives to* us (John 6:51). It cannot be emphasized too strongly that in saying "Take, eat" and offering the cup Jesus gave only the bread and the cup of diluted wine.

4) Another argument is the fact that the word "given" (in the longer text of Luke) was spoken by Jesus of his body, but does not occur in connection with the mention of the blood. In our liturgy we say "shed," not "given." If the body was given to the disciples, why not also the blood? The traditional view refutes itself.

5) The words "given" and "poured out" are present passive participles and should be rendered "about to be given," "about to be poured out (shed)," that is, on the cross. As we know, the present tense is sometimes used to express an immediate and certain future, and so here. See, e.g., Wymouth's translation. Had Jesus meant to give his body and blood *to* the disciples, he would have used the

present indicative and the dative *hymin,* as when he said, "My peace I give to you" (John 14:27).

6) All who believe that our Saviour gave his first disciples his body and blood (that is, "*to* you") should be consistent and believe that he gave these also to the "many," that is to say, to the children of God who are scattered abroad (John 11:52). But no writer, I dare say, has been so credulous as to believe and teach that Jesus gave his body and blood *to* the "many" at the time he instituted the sacrament. To believe the one is just as absurd and illogical as to believe the other.

7) Our Confessions, in speaking of this sacrament, say more about Christ's giving his body and blood *to* us than *for* us. Consequently, in the distribution of the sacrament, the words "for you" or "for thee" are often so pronounced as to hurry over the preposition, giving the communicants the impression that with the elements they are actually given the body and blood of Christ. The emphasis should be on the preposition, in accordance with our Saviour's frequent use of *hyper* in speaking of his mission to give his life *for* his own, and likewise the apostolic writers' use of it after him. In the phrases "for you," "for many," "for us," "for the sheep," "for sinners," etc., the preposition is the same.

8) The words "for you" were not spoken to Judas, as our church and other churches teach, for he was not present at the institution, only at the passover meal at which he received the sop. In the commentary on John's Gospel by Prof. John Peter Lange, the distinguished German theologian and exegete, this opinion is expressed at 13:30: "The institution of the Eucharist took place after v. 30. This is now pretty generally admitted among the best commentators." Thus also Robertson in his *Harmony of the Gospels* (1922). The Lord's Supper was not instituted for Judas or for any other hypocrite and unbeliever. "The words 'for you' require truly believing hearts." How can we still cling to "the three shibboleths," sacramental union, oral manducation, and communion of the unworthy?

9) The words of Jesus, "for you," "for many," were uttered once at the institution of the New Testament festival. He did not repeat them to each disciple, saying "'for thee." There is therefore no warrant in the words of institution for the celebrant's repeating them to the communicants. They should be said only at the "consecration" and in the sermon.

10) The words "for many" are just as important as the phrase "for you," and perhaps more significant, and they are therefore included in the Common Service and the Augustana liturgy. But they seem not to occur in the Book of Concord. Stress is laid on the words "this" and "for you," but not even a mention is made of the phrase "for many," and no reference is made to Matt. 20:28 and Mark 10:45, "to give his life as a ransom for many." We understand the expression to be a miosis, not saying as much as we think it should. In the *Lutheran Commentary* on Matt. 26:28 it is definitely stated that the word is here equivalent to "all." But we must take Jesus at his word. It is better, therefore, to take the

word as including the "many" for whom the sacrifice of Christ is effectual, and the "many" for whom the sacrament was instituted.

11) I affirm that in the sentences, "This is my body" and "This is the blood of my covenant," the word "This," *touto,* has no grammatical antecedent. In Greek it has the same number, gender, and case as the predicate noun, which the grammarians call assimilation. So also in Latin. There are at least a dozen similar sentences in the New Testament where the demonstrative pronoun followed by a copula refers grammatically only to the predicate nominative, looking forward, not back. No translation is perfect. Luther rendered *touto* by *das,* which is "that" in English, evidently because he supposed that this pronoun has an antecedent. Curt Stage in his modern German translation does the same. Weymouth makes bold to render Matt. 26:26b "Take this; it is my body." Sentences similar to the above are John 1:19; 6:14; Luke 22:53. There are, however, instances where "this" followed by a copula has an antecedent, but then it is of a different gender from that of the predicate noun. Robertson calls this the deictic use of the demonstrative pronoun. Thus, if Jesus had had reference to the bread (Greek, *artos*) when he said, "This is my body," he could have used the masculine form *houtos;* likewise, if he had meant the wine (Greek, *oinos*) in the cup, he could have said *houtos* instead of *touto*. Three examples of this use may suffice. "This (one) is the power of God" (Acts 8:10), where the antecedent is Simon Magus. "These are springs without water" (II Pet. 2:17), where "these" refers to false teachers. "These are two olive trees" (Rev. 11:4), where the antecedent is two witnesses. In each of these examples the pronoun is masculine, while the predicate noun is feminine. This use of the demonstrative pronoun does not occur in the words of institution. Our Lord had no grammatical antecedent in mind. The pronoun looks forward, not back. The connection with the preceding sentences is therefore symbolical. Jesus probably spoke to the disciples in Aramaic; but even so, his words must have been reported correctly in Greek.

12) The significance of the body and the blood of Christ "for you," "for many," spoken of in the institution, is not that they are to be received either by faith only, or by mouth, or both, as the traditionalists teach, but in their meaning for the apostles, other missionaries, and servants of Christ, as also for all believers, as indicated below: (a) Christ's body was prepared for him, that through it he might consecrate himself in perfect obedience to the eternal counsel of God for the salvation of men (Heb. 10:6, 7; 5:8. Eph. 5:2). (b) He himself bore our sins in his body on the tree, that we might die to sin and live to righteousness (I Pet. 2:24). His body was broken (I Cor. 11:24), bruised for our iniquities, and given "for you" (and "for many"). (c) Paul says, "We are always carrying in the body the death (Greek: killing) of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be manifested in our bodies" (II Cor. 4:10). The body of Jesus is here unexpressed, but clearly understood. (d) My brethren, says the

apostle, you have died to the law through the body of Christ (Rom. 7:4). (e) By God's will for Jesus "we have been consecrated through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Heb. 10:10). (f) Our Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body (Phil. 3:21). (g) The body of Jesus, while on earth, is a type of the mystical body, the congregation of believers, the church. In his exaltation he also became her head (Col. 1:18). In Col. 2:11 the apostle speaks of the circumcision of Christ as typifying the spiritual circumcision of the believers, "by putting off the body of flesh."

The significance of the blood of Christ is indicated in the following references: (a) To atone for our sins (Rom. 3:25). (b) The redemption price for our deliverance (Acts 20:28, Rev. 5:9). (c) For remission of sins and justification (Matt. 26:28, Rom. 5:9). (d) The means by which the new covenant between God and man was ratified (Matt. 26:28; cf. Heb. 9:18-20). (e) Gentiles brought near in the blood of Christ, to receive the blessing of the Abrahamic covenant (Eph. 2:13, Gal. 3:14), (f) Jesus suffered outside the gate in order to consecrate the people through his own blood (Heb. 13:12). (g) The saints have conquered Satan by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony (Rev. 12:11). (h) Through Christ it pleased God to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, by the blood of his cross (Col. 1:20).

13) Continuing the differences, we find that there is a misunderstanding and consequent misinterpretation of the words "for you" and "for many" in the liturgy in connection with forgiveness. It is expressly taught that remission of sins is granted with the eating and drinking in the sacrament. In his Catechism Luther defines the sacrament as "the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ under the bread and wine, given to us Christians to eat and drink as it was instituted by Christ himself." Nothing is said of confession and absolution, which are explained in a separate section. Of the benefits of the Communion Luther says, "They are pointed out in these words, given and shed for you for the remission of sins. Namely, through these words the remission of sins, life, and salvation are granted in the sacrament." Thus also in the Large Catechism. The Apology (pp. 277, 278) declares, "It is certain that the Lord's Supper was instituted on account of the remission of guilt." The Formula of Concord states that "forgiveness of sins, and all benefits which have been purchased by the death and shedding of the blood of Christ, are bestowed upon us in Christ's testament." But Christ connects remission of sins with the shedding of his blood which occurred on the cross, not at the mention of it in the words of the institution.

14) It is also taught in Lutheran circles that the blessed resurrection is promised in the Lord's Supper to the believing communicant. This is Catholic doctrine. In Deharbe's *Large Catechism* Holy Communion is said to impart four graces, the last of which reads: "It is a pledge of our future resurrection and

everlasting happiness." And Demetry's *Catechism* (Eastern Orthodox) enumerates seven benefits which believers may receive through the sacrament. The sixth one is "that their bodies may be raised at the second coming of Christ," and the seventh, "be assigned with the righteous to the enjoyment of eternal felicity." Henry E. Jacobs says at I Cor. 11:26, "It is a pledge of our Redemption." The Rev. Mr. Gerfen (Lutheran), in the chapter "Resurrection and the Lord's Supper" in his book, *Eucharist,* declares, "The characteristic of the Lord's Supper is that we receive the seal and assurance of a blessed resurrection if we partake of it in true faith. All that Christ procured for us by his suffering and death is given us in the Lord's Supper." This statement is not based on Scripture, but on the words in the Catechism, that life and salvation are granted us in the sacrament. Those who thus teach are applying the words of Jesus in John 6 to the institution. There is nothing in the words of institution about the Resurrection.

15) Regarding the meaning of the word *koinonia* in I Cor. 10:16, it should be noted that it is the bread and the cup that have *koinonia* with the body and blood of Christ, not we communicants. We have *koinonia* with Christ as a person. The proper sense of *koinonia* is association, not communion or participation.

16) All the New Testament appellations of the Lord's Supper, including *kyriakon deipnon* in I Cor. 11:20 (not *kyriou deipnon*), are subjective, not objective, and indicate that it is not an act of Christ but an act of the congregation in memory of him and to his honor, in accordance with his directives, "This do in remembrance of me," and specifically of his death. The word "sacrament" is derived from tradition, and yet seems to be more common than appellations based on Scripture.

17) The word "body" in I Cor. 11:29 is to be understood in the same sense as "body" in 10:17, where it clearly means the aggregate of believers, the congregation. Thus also Elliott in his Commentary.

18) There are many analogies between the Lord's Supper and the Passover which should be studied and used; yet I find in the Book of Concord only one reference to it, viz., regarding the time and place.

19) Christ and Paul emphasize the memorial character of the New Testament festival, which in this respect is the antitype of the Old Testament rite. Our church has regarded this as of less importance.

20) The Lord's Supper is not a mystery, and was not so regarded by the first disciples. But the giving of his flesh and blood and appropriating them according to John 6 is a mystery.

21) In I Cor. 11:26 Paul points out two important reasons for the observance of the Supper: (a) It is a memorial of our Lord's death and resurrection. (b) Being a pre-figuration of the marriage supper of the Lamb, it should enliven our hope in our full redemption (Luke 21:28) at his return (I Cor. 11:26), when he shall eat and drink with them in his kingdom (Matt. 28:29, Luke 22:30).

The Supper should therefore "often" be observed by the congregation. The above reasons are not brought out in our Confessions. But, fortunately, the first is expressed in the Sanctus and the second in the Prayer of Thanksgiving (Augustana liturgy). Every celebration should tend to the increase of our faith, and even more, our hope, as it did in the ancient church. The Communion prayers of the *Didache,* with their longing cry, *Marana Tha* (Our Lord, Come), testify to this.

22) The Apology declares (p. 214) that the effect of the Word and the rite is the same, and refers to Augustine as authority. But there is no scriptural authority for that statement.

The "real presence" of Christ is not that his body and blood are in the sacramental elements, but that he is in the Communion service in person, as when he said, Where people are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them. He is there as their Lord and Master, as he called himself in the night of the institution. He is there as the object of the love, honor, and devotion of the believing communicants who remember his suffering and death for them. He is there to remind them of his promised return when he shall receive them unto himself. At his table they have *koinonia,* communion, with *him,* not with his body and blood.

Life and Thought in World Lutheranism

The Folk Church in Denmark

Of slight immediate interest to the outside world was the fact that the council of Danish bishops in the spring of 1955 discussed the possibility of a new baptismal rite. In Denmark the matter caused a stir, as could be expected, but the rings of news caused by this pebble undoubtedly died in Danish waters. There would thus be little reason to write about it for The Lutheran Quarterly were it not for the fact that the factors involved stir an interest in the character and modus operandi of the Church of Denmark. Churches are sometimes shaken and shaped by turbulent events, but at other times they are shaped by slow movements and almost imperceptible changes. A brief glimpse may thus reveal the results of a long period of change.

The Church of Denmark is often a puzzle to outsiders. Even the people of Norway, who shared hundreds of years of its history, have difficulty in understanding what has happened in the last century, and Americans, who blissfully categorize the church world after the patterns of "free churches" on the one hand and "state churches" on the other, are about as ignorant of Danish church life as they are of that of Greenland. For this they can hardly be blamed, for things have happened in a slow and introvertive fashion in the Danish church, but the opportunity might well be seized so that a glimpse is turned into a fuller view. What, then, does a council of bishops discussing a baptismal rite and a subsequent public exchange of ideas reveal to us about the character of the Danish church? The answer to this question must, of necessity, be historical.

During the Reformation the Danish church was wrenched away from Rome, and the king made himself its head. The power of the bishops was largely broken (this is where a basic difference between the churches of Denmark and Sweden begins), and when the Church Ordinance of 1537 arranged the affairs of the church, the overseers were called "superintendents." The public soon restored the ancient name of bishops, but in effect the bishops have continued to be superintendents to this day. They function under the head of the church, and for three centuries the head of the church was the king. Today he is still the head, but in name only.

The Church Ordinance did not establish a confessional basis for the church. It relied on the spirit of the Reformation and the supervision of the bishops. Before the century was over, the Augsburg Confession had been adopted, but the Formula of Concord was rejected by the king and has never since been approved. In 1660 the king became an absolute monarch, but he was pledged to the Augsburg Confession, and in 1685 and 1688, respectively, an authorized ritual and an authorized altar book were decreed.

The absolute rule of the king within

the church lasted, with a few nineteenth century qualifications, until the democratic constitution of 1849, and in that period it is justified to speak about a state church. The new constitution, and its three successors up to the present, do not speak of a state church but of a *"Folkekirke,"* which is a people's church or a folk church. The idea of this is that the church is not, and must not be, an institution imposed from above, but that it is the church of the people which is governed by the people through their chosen representatives. Though the king nominally is the head of the church, the affairs of the church are legislated by the parliament and administered by the cabinet which is responsible to the parliament.

So far the system is no different from that of other state or people's churches in a political situation determined by mid-nineteenth century interest in a liberal political program. The prevailing concern was for the rights and privileges of the people, and no great concern was given to the inner nature of the church, save to state that it was to be "Evangelical Lutheran." Church and state were not separated, and the whole inherited administrative system was retained, but the constitution stated that the affairs of the church were to be arranged or ordered by law. This constitutional proviso has been variously interpreted, some taking it to mean that a separate constitution and organization for the church was to be set up, and others taking it to mean that parliament was to legislate for the church.

No separate organization was set up, however, and although this, as mentioned above, is not unique, the motivations for the failure to do this are, in part, peculiar to Denmark. The ordinary forces of economic and political liberalism were quite naturally present, but besides these there were the influences of Grundtvig and Kierkegaard, both by now strongly developed. Grundtvig's influence had placed strong emphasis upon the confessional and congregational nature of the church, which was centered not in office but in the sacraments, and he had been a vigorous advocate of freedom within the church. Kierkegaard had excoriated the "official" church and had emphasized the life in faith of the individual. Neither of these influences favored the establishment of an autonomous church organization, either separated from the state or within the governmental framework, although the Grundtvigian movement was, by this time, on its way toward institutionalizing its point of view.

The second great revival movement of the century (the Grundtvigian movement was the first) grew strong in the last quarter of the century. It was called the Inner Mission, and it was strongly influenced by Kierkegaard's emphasis upon the faith-life of the individual. Consequently its emphasis was upon the conversion of the individual and upon the selective fellowship of like-minded people, while it scorned the affairs of the world, including the affairs of the official church. In other words, in its first phase the Danish Inner Mission was a conventicle movement. It therefore had no interest at this time in the creation of a separate church. It is an interesting characteristic of the Danish

church that it does not feature separatistic movements.

There was, of course, a large segment of the church which did not share the above-mentioned viewpoints. These men followed the leadership of Mynster and Martensen, but they were largely suspicious of the democratic tendencies of the day and were reluctant to take the authority away from the established and official church and give it to the people. In the twentieth century the so-called "high church" group, if it can be called a group, has favored a separate church establishment, and the Inner Mission, as it grew in numbers and influence, also swung over to support of the separatist movement, but this trend has been counteracted by the labor movement which was opposed to separation. The labor movement was influenced in part by Marxism, in part by the radical "realism" of the Brandes movement, and in part by the absence of a revival movement in the church which was concurrent with the rise of labor. When Labor was growing strong, the Grundtvigian movement and the Inner Mission had become identified with other social classes.

The point of view, that the constitutional proviso regarding the ordering of the affairs of the church by law meant legislation within the state framework, has in practice won out so far. This legislation provided for the liberalizing and democratizing of the established church. In 1855 the bond which tied an individual to his parish was severed. In 1866 a law was passed which provided for "elective congregations" which could call and salary their own minister but which, uniquely, remained within the framework of the official church. This latter law has been largely instrumental in providing a safety valve and preventing the formation of dissident churches. So much for examples of the liberalizing of the church. The democratizing was largely taken care of by a law of 1903 which established parish councils, elected by the people and given considerable authority, including the nomination of parish ministers. The appointment of ministers still goes through the channels of bishops and the department of church affairs, but seldom is the nomination bypassed. The other law was passed in 1920 and provided for the election of bishops by members of the church councils.

The result of this whole development has been the gradual creation of what has been called the "roomy church of the people," a church in which there is room for greatly varying points of view and interpretations. Grundtvigians, Inner Mission people, Barthians, Bultmannites, social-minded, foreign-mission-minded, liturgically-minded church members, low-church people—all these and perhaps many more, who are not necessarily organized and whose interests may and do overlap, live together as one large church family. They argue, they even quarrel and denounce one another's views and ways, but they are held together by the bond of a common faith, a common tradition, and a common establishment, the church of the people.

The question arises: Is this church Lutheran? The answer of the Danes would be a definite Yes, although they

would not stress the Lutheran character as much as is done in other countries where church rivalries are stronger. An objective observer would note that the official confession of the folk church, its historic background and tradition, and its theology are Lutheran. One who has lived within the congregational life of the people would also confess that this life is basically Lutheran, but with the added emphasis of Grundtvig upon the historic-confessional and the covenant-sacramental character of the church, and with the influence of Kierkegaard upon the faith-life of the individual. The security of the official framework and the absence of rival churches have made the church less apt to insist upon the rigid formulations of a certain age, and the church has been highly receptive to theological influences from without. In many ways it affords a testing ground for a meeting of modern movements with sound tradition, but this testing ground has been ignored by other countries because it is so unique and therefore almost esoteric in character. Whether or not the church life is strong, measured by church attendance and by direct participation in the life of a nation, is a much debated question at the present, and it lies outside the scope of this report.

But is the church Lutheran in the sense that it hews rigorously to the Lutheran doctrinal line? This question will be asked especially by American Lutherans, for whom doctrinal clarity and purity are of paramount importance. A Dane would counter the question by another and would wonder which of the "pure" Lutheran interpretations of Americans is to be taken as the norm. He would also ask where the authoritative Lutheran answer to many modern questions, including theological ones, is to be found. Having said this, he would probably answer the question in the negative, but he would point to the historical development of the twentieth century in Denmark, where it has been found impossible to maintain the official church as the official arbiter of doctrine. Already in 1817 the bishops of Denmark had expressed the view that it was the spirit and not the letter of the Confessions which counted. In 1834 the Supreme Court verified this judgment, and in modern times it has been tried in vain to exclude pastors from office for doctrinal deviations. For some people this is a weakness; for others it is an expression of Christian strength. The authority for the faith and its proclamation is not in the hands of officials but in the hands of the living Christian fellowship as, they would claim, it should be. Heresy trials can not take place in the church of Denmark; this has been determined by practice, though not by law.

Where, the reader may ask, is the "news" in all this? The news is that the discussion concerning the true nature of the church and the Gospel constantly goes on (cf. "Discussion of Eternal Life and Immortality in Denmark," in Vol. VI (1954), pp. 164, 165). At the present time it is the problem of the baptismal rite which the council of bishops is considering and which has created a lively debate. Another time it is a biblical or theological issue. Some of these problems can be settled practically by the au-

thorities, as when three women pastors were ordained a few years ago (incidentally, the present cabinet member for ecclesiastical affairs, and thus the administrative head of the church, is a woman); some of them are settled in the course of time by the life and debate of the church. The news comes and goes, but it must be evaluated within the framework of the Folk Church of Denmark.

It might be interesting to append a little information about the nature of the present baptismal controversy. All Danish church people are agreed about the fundamental significance of baptism as the sacramental beginning of the Christian life. Grundtvig's emphasis upon the covenant character of this sacrament is seldom denied within the folk church. This emphasis is demonstrated in the fact that each child (or the parents of each child) at baptism is asked and responds to the full wording of the Apostles' Creed, and also in the fact that the Apostles' Creed usually is called the "baptismal covenant." There is no debate about the essential significance of this. The problem arises when large parishes, especially in the cities, may have a large number of children presented for baptism on a single Sunday. Then the use of the full creed for each child may create a lengthy and repetitious situation. It has therefore been suggested that the baptismal covenant could equally well be established if the whole group, incidentally the whole congregation, confessed the faith together, whereupon the minister would ask in each individual case, Will you be baptized on (in) this faith? Other suggestions for alleviating the practical problem have, of course, been made, but it is the problem, whether or not the departure from the traditional form would do away with the covenant character of baptism, which has caused the discussion. No solution has yet been commonly accepted, but the debate is on.

JOHANNES KNUDSEN

Correspondence and Comment

A Rebuttal on India

As a rejoinder to the criticism of my article, "Our Christian Task in India," in The Lutheran Quarterly for May, 1954, let me make the following brief observations.

In his letter Mr. Delbert Anderson charges me with drawing "conclusions which are dangerous because they are merely half true." Mr. Anderson's first point of criticism fails to understand the method of sociological analysis in which I have ferreted out the social forces which are being exerted upon the Indian community. In this case I have taken only the most powerful contenders for supremacy: Hinduism, Communism, and Western society. It certainly is not possible to charge me with the naiveté of thinking that Western society and the kingdom of God are one and the same thing. The entire section on the analysis of Western society should speak for itself on this matter, but let me quote from page 93: "The crisis of Western man has become articulated in the fundamental cleavage between the orders of collectivism and individualism." And again: "Christianity, confronted with this dilemma, says the dilemma is false. . . ." Here I have demonstrated my own criticism of Western society from the viewpoint of a prophetic Christian witness.

In regard to contemporary Indian society, Mr. Anderson charges me with saying that it is "completely pagan." This he does not quote because he cannot. Nowhere is such a statement made or intended. Indian society today is a complex of many forces: Hinduism, Islam, Sikhism, Jainism, Parsiism, Animisim, Buddhism, Nationalism, Tribalism, Caste, Race, Linguistic Separatism, and many other forces too numerous to mention. All of these are pagan, except Islam, and are forces which may be designated secular as opposed to religious; none of them are Christian, yet no one would deny the Christian impact upon Indian culture in the past 150 years. I was concerned only with the chief contending forces for cultural hegemony. When I speak of Hinduism as such a force, I am perfectly correct in calling it pagan; and if there is irresponsibility in India today, and there certainly is, much of it may be traced to pagan roots of Maya fatalism.

When Mr. Anderson next speaks of the work done by Britain and by Christian missions he is not taking issue with anything I have said since this is precisely the kind of impact I have advocated throughout the article. Too often Mr. Anderson protests his short stay in India as if this gives him the privilege of Sir Oracle, but no one can really understand India unless he has lived in a village where 90% of the people live in mud huts with thatched roofs in the utmost ignorance, superstition, poverty, and fear. These are the real Indians, and they have scarcely been touched by Western so-

ciety, either Christian or non-Christian. These are the people who will have to choose between Communism or democracy, and part of our task in a democratic nation which professes Christianity will be to keep the doors open in India so that our Christian witness can be made.

Mr. Anderson's final point concerning the political maneuvering of Prime Minister Nehru is a mystery to me since nothing in my article could possibly lead one to suspect any opposition on my part to what Mr. Nehru is trying to do. The fact that visas are being denied is simply a symptom of the confusion in the India government under the various pressures. This has an old history going back to the time just before Independence came, at which time my own visa was delayed for six months. Nehru himself will always remain high in my esteem as the personal friend who rescued a valuable movie camera for me after it had been confiscated in Kashmir.

Of course, there are political overtones which make it difficult for us to expedite our missionary task. These political factors are precisely what we are concerned with. We need a friendly culture in which to plant the Gospel. We are in danger of losing it. How shall we obtain it? This is our task. My concern is not that we should make India into a new country dominated by Western culture, but that we should bring the Gospel to India, and in so doing we must recognize that this is not either exclusively individualistic or collectivistic, but that the Gospel concerns the whole man, the whole society, and indeed the whole creation, for "God has put all things in subjection under his [Christ's] feet."

ROBERT PAUL ROTH

IDEOLOGY VERSUS RELIGION— NO TACTICAL BLUNDERS

It is well that readers occasionally state their agreement or disagreement with items appearing in periodicals they read more or less carefully. This is no less true with regard to one's fellow Lutherans in bodies with which one is not in fellowship; even protest or criticism are forms of communion. Let me say that THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY has consistently brought significant and challenging articles. Not least interesting have been the occasional notes and reports bearing on the restudy of our liturgy both here and abroad.

However, the brief study entitled "Communism's Tactical Blunders" by Walter R. Wietzke in the May, 1955, number must have stirred no little disagreement. Its very brevity precludes complete clarity on certain points, and grounds for variance may differ according to one's basic understanding of Communism. However, it should be pointed out that certain aspects of the problem throw Wietzke's "tactical blunders" into a completely different light.

First, regarding the definition of Communism, it appears that the article operates in terms of Communism's stated objective, that embraced in its tenet of dialectical materialism, the promotion of the class struggle with all that this entails. Later this same objective is characterized as "serving Mammon" and is excoriated as a Godless materialism. Now, different un-

derstandings of Communism are possible and viable. For example, it has appealed to many simply as a constructive handling of the social and economic questions; for these people Communism's interpretation of history and inversion of Hegel's dialectic are altogether secondary to its social achievements. For others, Communism can only be understood as a new Islam, as a vital religious faith that seizes the imaginations and energies of people in a universal commitment. The commitment may be pseudo-religious, since this is not ultimate reality to which it is made, but it is nonetheless something to which he gives his devotion, on the basis of which fundamental decisions are made. Or Communism may be identified, as it has been to a considerable degree in recent years, with the national interests of its great power-center, Russia.

It is the contention of the present writer that Wietzke does not give sufficient attention to these different possible meanings of "Communism," and particularly to Communism as an ideology. Thus, in the means-ends continuum he is dealing with, the policies Communism has adopted may be judged "blunders" only in the light of its great tactician's warnings against becoming preoccupied with religious questions. This must be said apart from the problems raised in the official and much-vaunted "unity of practice and theory." It must be remembered that along with Lenin's warning against "preaching war against God," which Wietzke brings out, is Marx's insistence that "The beginning of all criticism is the criticism of religion." Religion, like art, politics, morality, or law, constitutes an "ideology," a mask that hides the class struggle going on underneath; it is not based on the will to transform reality, but tries to preserve present evils by building a theoretical "superstructure" above the economic foundation to justify these evils. A radical critique must be leveled against the attempts of the privileged classes to conceal or obfuscate the just interests of the oppressed working class. Religion is a set of "false" ideas that merely promote the interests of the vested classes. The gods must be dethroned as a prerequisite for the revolt against those who have lived off the gods.

Thus Communism's critique of religion—all too accurate and fitting in its exposure of class-bound or "reactionary" churches—is an aspect of its critique of bourgeois society. Although the thrust of its dialectic must be directed toward "changing society" rather than talk about changes, still the militant atheism of the great Communist leaders has been such an integral part of the total world-view that one may question the use of the term "tactical blunders." Many quotations might be adduced from Lenin to *support* anti-religious *propaganda,* though Wietzke accurately points to his warnings against religious *persecution.* Still with all the warning against persecution, where is one to leave off encouraging the disappearance of superstition?

To be sure, one difficulty involves Communism's strange fortune of being granted its grand experiment amid the unique religiousness of the Russian people. Yet the countless examples of restrictions on or discouragement of

religious life, educational activity, and philanthropic work in Iron Curtain countries indicate not only that these alien loyalties must be restricted but that the new Messianism or, from another aspect, Utopianism, must foster no rival salvation. Dostoevsky summed this up most incisively in *The Brothers,* "For socialism is not merely the labor question, it is before all things the aesthetic question, the question of the form taken by atheism today, the question of the tower of Babel built without God, not to mount to Heaven from earth but to set up Heaven on earth."

Certainly attempts have been made, and considerable success has been gained, in identifying the Christian church in the East with the cause and conscience of the regimes in power. In this respect the only difference with the West, and particularly America, is that the Christian piety of the Western democracies is a much more suave and deceptive thing. According to a possible definition of Communism—e.g., in Karl Barth's terms of an attack on the social problem—such collaboration becomes "tactical success." But in such a case one chooses to interpret Communism with no, or merely incidental, reference to its significant ideological structure. In terms of its ideological and totalitarian claims the attacks of Communism on religion and the churches have been quite consistent.

Again, it might appear that the third error, "the displacement of the community" is indisputably an unnecessary and stupid action, possibly "the most costly blunder of all." But from the standpoint of its ideology this was a quite normal and understandable procedure. Inherited stupidities cannot be permitted to block the progressive and inevitable march into the future. For the sake of achieving the new Workers' Republics, the mass deportations of entire communities may be a very logical thing. The idea of the new order is aided in such instances by the interests of totalitarian leveling. The allegiance now reckoned of supreme importance is not the Islamic way of life, or orthodox Christianity, or even Ukrainian or Latvian national sentiments, but the realization of the new society, or, as more recently, a strong Soviet Union. One is dealing here with a magnificent vision of what the future may one day be; it is an obsession with the future; those elements in a population which have passed middle age and are unable to cooperate wholeheartedly in the cult must not be permitted to obstruct the path to the proletariat's future.

In brief, the foregoing remarks are an attempt to emphasize the role of the ideology in relation to these actions. To be sure, Communism considered in terms of a social revolution is not so unalterably opposed to religion, the churches, or nationalism. One might point to a great many constructive relationships in such a connection. But the Messianism of the movement has produced the millions of martyrs and the perpetual sadness of the forced labor camps. Here we have witnessed once again the glories of the *ecclesia pressa;* totalitarians may well fear the pockets of resistance lurking in an uncompromising Christian faith. A political system that proclaims itself absolute can see only danger in a re-

ligion that stresses an appeal to the individual's conscience. To the "Yes" of the church to the legitimate claims of Communism must be added the "No" to its pretensions as a philosophy of life. Certainly churchmen play into the hands of capitalism's pious profiteers when they condemn everything involved in Communism out of hand. And as far as ideologies go, democracy, too, is vitally dependent on an ideology which most of us take for granted, but which has and still does enter into conflict with Christianity on a number of points. Although Marx first raised this term to prominence as a *Kampfbegriff* in his application of the concept to the questionable Christianity of the West, one does not do justice to Communism as a comprehensive philosophical system or as a system of political economy unless one deals with it—at least partially or even alternately—as an immense power structure and as a fateful ideology. ERNEST B. KOENKER

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

From Faith to Faith. Essays on Old Testament Literature. By B. Davie Napier. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955. 223 pages. $3.

The present book is a good illustration of what is happening today in the resurgent field of Old Testament studies. The nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth had exhibited an array of scholars in the role of surgeons, who, scalpel in hand, "performed a series of exceedingly thorough exploratory operations" on the Old Testament. It seemed that some even looked upon the operation as "an autopsy." But the Old Testament proved itself so viable and indeed relevant to modern times that it forced a new intellectual climate upon the scholars, and we are, as has often been stated, in a new era in Old Testament studies.

In this new climate some critical scholars have abandoned the familiar theory of the JEDP documents, and have substituted other approaches which to them seem less artificial. The majority, however, have retained the familiar analysis, but they have removed it from the center of interest, and have modified it, by introducing other methods of dealing with the literary material. This is true of the form critics, the archeologically oriented scholars, and others, as has been traced, for instance, by Herbert Hahn in his *Old Testament and Modern Research.*

Biblical theology of the Old Testament has become one of the vital methods of approaching the biblical material in the present time. This approach seeks to understand the religious ideas which were held by the men of the Old Testament, and believes that these ideas have permanent relevance in many cases. It believes that apart from such an approach there is no complete understanding of the Old Testament. There is a disposition to see strong elements of unity in the Old Testament. It is seen to be not merely the incoherent literary deposit of many different authors, but rather the achievement of a great synthesis, a putting together of the parts in a creative way, in accordance with deep and basic concepts held by the community of Israel, who transmitted the Old Testament to her successors. "The sense of unity achieved in Genesis, . . . or for that matter in the entire Old Testament, is impressive despite the diversity of sources from which it was created. . . . The Old Testament conveys the impression of coherent unity—a unity achieved in the central themes and presuppositions of the community of Israel."

Professor Napier's book, from which I have quoted, is a good example of this method and approach. He looks at the wholes, and applies the insight gained thereby upon the details. But he has not abandoned the results of the older analytical studies; rather he supplements them, and goes beyond them. He favors a method that goes from the wholes to the parts, and also from the details to the larger wholes, for, as he puts it, the study of any literature must be "thus dialectical."

But what has brought about the unity of the Old Testament? What is it that gives us the key to this great literature? This our author finds in the *faith* of Israel, and the title, *From Faith to Faith,* is a felicitous choice. The faith of Israel is studied in the great central themes which run through the Old Testament in all its variety. These themes occur in such literary types as legends, laws, history, and so forth. The book is, so to speak, a series of case studies from five literary types, showing how these themes occur in all, and bring out Israel's faith. The six themes studied are: creation, human sinfulness, divine judgment, the covenant, redemption, and a final consummation. These

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

themes constitute the faith of Israel (although it is not claimed that they are exhaustive), and they give unity to the Old Testament. One might wonder why Israel's conception of God might not have been enumerated, but it should be said that the concept of God is brought to expression in the themes of creation, judgment, redemption and the rest.

These themes are traced in the "Myths" of Genesis 1-11, in the "Legends" of Genesis 12-50, portions of history in the period of Saul and David, a sample of prophetic literature in Isaiah, and finally in an excellent chapter on the codes of law. One senses the influence of Gunkel when the Genesis material is characterized as myth and legend. It is in line with much modern scholarship, which looks upon myth and legend as valuable forms of truth, in which the faith of Israel necessarily expressed itself. The author acknowledges the influence of Johannes Pedersen, H. Wheeler Robinson, and Gerhard von Rad.

An important point the author makes is that when the community of Israel edited and preserved certain stories and pieces (whether myth, legend, history, or law, etc,) it was because she read her own experience of history and of God in them. The faith of Abraham is portrayed; then the author shows that the stories of Abraham, in spite of minor inconsistencies (as he views it) reflect Israel's own experience in its later history. Israel sees in them God's demand of faith, and her own faithlessness and its consequences. He shows that the same pattern of disobedience and rejection is found in the Fall of Adam and Eve and the history of Saul, and this correspondence of the same spiritual parts is due not to literary dependence, "but to a consistent and unifying quality of faith in Israel: human sin and divine judgment are regarded as fundamental and formative realities in experience and history."

The author shows good insight into Old Testament problems, which is due in part to his effort to approach it with "empathy," a sort of inner sympathy. There is a fine enthusiasm for the great qualities of Old Testament thought and literature, which once or twice leads the author to attribute some of its insights to "inspiration" and "the revelation of God himself."

Some readers, and the reviewer among them, might still feel a little disquietude at some points. They might feel that "contradictions" are yet too often seen in the biblical literature, and too much acceptance still accorded to the JEDP analysis. And the question might also be asked whether the strong impression of unity in the Old Testament, which the author describes, should not be attributed to the fact that it is the same God, the God of History, who acts and who reveals himself in the different periods and varying parts. It is God, as well as the faith of Israel, who has created the Old Testament, as the author himself hints, perhaps too cautiously.

The book is readable, well written and printed, and uses a minimum of notes. The thoughtful reader, especially the minister, will find it stimulating, and the Old Testament specialist will find it meaty enough to justify his interest.

ETHAN MENGERS

Jeremiah, Chronologically Arranged, Translated and Interpreted. By Elmer A. Leslie. Nashville: The Abingdon Press, 1954. 349 pages. $4.75.

This is a new commentary on the book of Jeremiah. The author does not progress chapter by chapter. He has attempted to construct the sequence of events in the life of Jeremiah and arrange the content of the book in a biographical order. The Masoretic text is set forth in a new and original translation. It is a free translation which reads easily and at the same time is quite faithful to the text of Scripture. While there are many places where one can not agree with the author, on the whole it must be said that the interpretation of the text is interesting and stimulating. An instance of such detail is found on page 69. The author makes it clear that he assumes the Ten Commandments are a late development in the religion of Israel. This reader was surprised to note that the author assigns the great chapters of consolation (chapters 30 and 31) to the early ministry of Jeremiah. On the basis of internal evidence, they ap-

pear to reflect the catastrophe of the siege and fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. as well as the second deportations of the Judahites to Babylon.

Every student of Jeremiah is aware that the arrangement of the chapters is not chronological but rather topical in nature. Many of the chapters are dated. For example, chapter 21 begins: This is the word which came to Jeremiah from the Lord, when King Zedehiah sent to him. . . ." This king did not begin to rule until 598 B.C. Then the superscription to chapter 36 reads: "In the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah, king of Judah, this word came to Jeremiah. . . ." In terms of biblical chronology, this reference and the content of the chapter takes us back to 605 B.C. In this book the author has sought to construct the sequence of events in the life of Jeremiah and relate the appropriate portions of Scripture to these events. For this reason, we assume that such a book would necessitate and involve a complete re-arrangement of the chapters as we are familiar with them.

There is another aspect of the book, however, in which we can not share the author's methodology. Students of the Scriptures in our day are familiar with the Baltimore School of Old Testament. This new tradition assumes that the prophetic books are an anthology of the messages which the particular prophet spoke. The sermons of the prophet were preserved in written form and by oral tradition. The accuracy of oral tradition in the Ancient Near East is incredible to our modern mind. From this literature and in the course of time, portions of their sermons began to circulate together. These units have been collected into the respective books of the prophet in concern. These messages were spoken by the prophets on different occasions. Carefully prepared poetic discourse was one of their favorite mediums of communication. But only a portion of their messages appears to have been preserved. In the course of transmission, selections from several sermons have been joined together. A single chapter of Scripture may contain portions from different sermons which were spoken originally under somewhat different circumstances. When today's student meets different concepts within a single chapter, this then is not valid evidence for the assumption that part of the chapter is a later addition to the text. Many critical scholars have carried this method to the point of absurdity. The Baltimore School is a reaction against the extremes of this methodology. The author of this book identifies himself with the older critical scholars. He has gleaned from the present book of Jeremiah a large portion of Scripture and has included this in a chapter which is a fifty page supplement to the text and interpretation of the original work of the prophet. Upon his own admissions, the author follows the critical commentary of W. Rudolph on Jeremiah. On the one hand, the critical study of the text has its place. On the other hand, it can be carried to the point where it weakens the testimony of Scripture. In this respect, the author of this book is subject to criticism.

JOHN V. HALVORSON

Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. New Material from the Second Revised Edition. Edited by James B. Pritchard. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955. 24 pages. $1.

Owners of the first edition of *Ancient Near Eastern Texts,* published by Princeton University in 1950 and reviewed in the *Lutheran Quarterly,* May, 1951, will appreciate the opportunity of bringing their volume nearly abreast of the second revised edition, published in 1955, which this little booklet affords.

The new edition contains the following additional material: *Canaanite and Aramaic Inscriptions,* translated by Franz Rosenthal; *South-Arabian Inscriptions,* translated by A. Jamme; and *Akkadian Myths and Epics, New Texts,* translated by E. A. Speiser. Most of the contributors to the first edition have made corrections and brought their bibliographies up to date. The new edition, due to its increase in size from 526 pages to 544 quarto pages, sells at $17.50, an increase of $2.50 over the original price of the volume.

Purchasers of this little brochure will be able to bring their first edition up to date,

except for the revised bibliographies and corrections of translations appearing in the first volume. The brochure contains the new translations by Professors Rosenthal, Jamme and Speiser, as well as an index of names for the Canaanite, Aramaic and South-Arabic Inscriptions.

ROBERT H. BOYD

Discovering Buried Worlds. By André Parrot. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. 127 pages. $3.75.

This is the first in a series of volumes on biblical archaeology. It is more than a book about some diggings in the earth. Specifically, the author confines himself to the geographical area with which he is best informed, Mesopotamia and Phoenicia. But he writes with the insights which only a long term of duty on the field can possibly give a man. André Parrot has worked on French archaeological expeditions over a period of twenty-seven years, and at the following sites: Nerab, Baalbek, Byblos, Larsa, Tello, and Mari. The last site has occupied his time from 1933-39 and from 1951 to the present.

Anyone who is well acquainted with the methods employed in the excavation of superimposed city levels may want to skip lightly over the first chapter since it deals with this subject. It is written with a good deal of color and human interest, however, in a field where this is often omitted. Unless one be specifically interested in the names and the sites associated with them in the imposing history of archaeology, the second chapter may be rather dull reading. It is a good reference chapter, though, and impresses one with the fact that countries such as France with more meager financial resources have made the larger contributions to this science.

One will want to read with more care the chapter entitled "Five Thousand Years of Civilization." Here history is relived by one who has had a good share in recovering the lost civilizations, empires, and peoples. A fine series of thirty plates puts the reader on the scene where history was being made. Excavation sites, museum pieces, and present day views of ancient cities help to tell the story of the first three chapters of the book, but especially the third one. One may want to disagree with his matter-of-fact identification of the remains of a 6th century B.C. Ziggurat at Babylon with the Tower of Babel of Genesis 11 (84). But this does not lessen the historical value of the chapter. The histories of the Mesopotamians and Phoenicians from the fifth millenium B.C. to the entrance of Alexander upon the scene are interestingly sketched.

It is chapter four, covering less than twenty pages, which is worth the price of the book. Beginning with a series of the more spectacular areas of coincidence of the biblical history and archaeological findings, he hastens on to the areas where these are difficult to find or impossible to make. He shows how these first great finds (e.g., the Lachish accounts of the tribute paid by Jehu to Shelmaneser III, and which sides so well with I Kings 19:16 and II Kings 9 and 10) gave many the false impression that archaeology was engaged in attempting to substantiate the Bible. It was not until Friedrich Delitzsch that the argument was raised to a spiritual plane. The findings of this science must be used to help us better understand the historic setting against which the Old Testament was written. In this he follows Eissfeldt. If one feels self conscious when the author levels his sights against those who disparage history while clinging to the "Word Alone," then one must be frank to admit that much of what he writes has been true of us. We have been too quick to accept that which comes from the serious research of such men as Parrot, provided it perpetuates our views "about" the Bible. But we have been slow to reconsider our positions in the light of findings which have not fulfilled our expectations.

Archaeology has been successful in three areas: "(1) It has confirmed certain historic facts. (2) It has established the exact locations of certain places. (3) It has restored to us the soul of those vanished peoples itself, by revealing in the documents dug from the soil their way of life."

It is reassuring to note the inclusions of a large number of American works in the

bibliography of a work originally written in French.

WENDELL W. FRERICHS

The Sword and the Cross. By Robert M. Grant. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955. 144 pages. $2.75.

Here we have a concise presentation of the historical data essential to understand the fundamental difficulty faced by Christians during the first two centuries as they tried to make the distinction implied in the words of Jesus when he said, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's," and of Paul, when he wrote that "the powers that be are ordained of God." The attempt to solve the problem of the relation between church and state by serving God with one's spirit while serving Caesar with one's body and goods encountered complications that were no less formidable in the formative period of Christianity than they are today. For the hard fact was that when the Caesar was insane he deified himself, and when he was sane he did not prevent others from deifying him; so that it was regarded as treason against the Roman state to claim that Christ and not Caesar was the Lord of all.

Yet the policy of the Roman government toward Christianity and other foreign religions shows a constant zigzag between tolerance and persecution. Why? To answer this question, Professor Grant studies briefly the relevant historical materials from the legendary founding of Rome by Romulus in 753 B.C. to the edict of tolerance issued by Galerius, April 26, A.D. 311, after the failure of the last feverish efforts to restore the old Roman religion. At every stage of this thousand-year history he shows the connection between the social and political conditions in the Roman empire and the sporadic outbursts of persecution against Christianity and other foreign religions, which the Roman patriots held responsible for civil disturbances, military disasters, and such calamities as fire and earthquake, famine and pestilence. Reading this book is like seeing in a mirror the reflection of the troubled relations between Christianity and government all over the world today.

The Romans attributed the founding, preservation, and perpetuity of their state to their gods, whose good will had to be secured by rites which had to be performed with the utmost precision. The introduction of foreign religions, which the Romans called "superstitions," was feared and punished, because it would lead to the wrath of their ancestral gods.

But these old Roman gods were the gods of the aristocracy, and the authorities were under constant pressure from the lower classes to introduce these foreign cults. The old gods were not able to keep pace with the changing times and the expanding empire. Especially in times of military defeat, crop failure, or pestilence, more efficacious religions were sought and imported from Greece and the Orient. But these religions were often accompanied by immoral cult practices. Their meetings were held at night, and political plots against unpopular rulers were liable to be hatched in them. Along with them came astrologers and prophets who could be employed by conspirators against the state. Thus foreign religions came to be associated with the class warfare and civil disturbances that bedeviled the Roman empire all through its history, and those who introduced foreign gods were feared and hated. "To the Romans foreign religion, immorality, and conspiracy were closely associated" (p. 20).

In the case of foreign religions other than Judaism and Christianity the mutual adjustment required for coexistence was comparatively easy. The Jews, who acknowledged only one God, had acquired the right to sacrifice and pray for rather than to the emperors, and as long as the Christians were not distinguished from the Jews, they enjoyed this same privilege. But the Jews were not popular, and in Palestine there was always a smoldering resentment against Roman rule, which was liable at any time to burst out into Messianic rebellion. The Christians, who were warning men to repent lest they be slain with the sword or burned up in the fire when the Messiah came to judge the world, very naturally came under suspicion in such crises as the great fire in Rome under Nero. In the reign of Trajan,

when it finally became possible for the Romans to distinguish Christianity from Judaism, and when the crucial legislation intended to destroy Christianity was passed, the government authorities had only to read the Revelation of John for evidence to confirm their conclusion that Christianity was dangerous and had to be suppressed.

One of the special values of Dr. Grant's book is that it traces the effect of this fiery apocalypse during the first century of its existence. Written at the end of the reign of Domitian, this revelation is full of hatred for Rome; it predicts a Parthian victory and the total destruction of the city seated on the seven hills. But not all Christians shared this attitude:

"We may perhaps believe that some Christians supposed it necessary to publish an entirely different explanation of the Christian religion, the Gospel of John, in which the otherworldly nature of Christianity was stressed and in which it was stated that the authority of the Roman government was given it by God. Jesus did not suffer as a criminal but as a divinely predestined victim of Jewish malice. Had he not been crucified he could not have drawn all men to himself. And in the gospel of John there remain hardly any traces of the primitive Christian eschatology. The gospel has become something beyond and almost unrelated to human affairs" (p. 57).

But it is to be observed that Jesus, in this Gospel, does not take his disciples out of this world, but sends them, as his Father has sent him, to bear much fruit in it; and when he says to Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world," he certainly does not mean that it is not *in* this world as well as in heaven. Moreover, as Dr. Grant himself remarks, one of the reasons why Christianity seemed dangerous to the Romans was because it was "highly organized and closely knit," and one of the purposes of the Gospel of John is to contribute to the knitting. More traces of the primitive eschatology remain in this Gospel than our author allows for; the evidence is presented and discussed in C. K. Barrett's *The Gospel according to St. John* (New York: Macmillan, 1955).

However, Dr. Grant is right in raising the question whether all Christians were innocent of the charges brought by the Romans against this new foreign religion. Some of these charges, such as immorality and cannibalism, rested on misunderstanding or deliberate, vicious distortion by the enemies of the Christians; but one can see how easily the charge of incendiarism and hatred of the human race could grow out of preaching in which God's judgment on the world was constantly threatened in terms of fire and sword and pestilence on the great majority of mankind. The mistake of the Christians was to suppose that God was going to avenge the wrongs which his chosen people were suffering at the hands of the Romans by means that Jesus had forbidden them to use when he told them to love their enemies and pray for their persecutors. If even they were not yet ready to put sole confidence in forgiveness as God's ultimate method of dealing with sinners, the Romans could hardly be expected to use any other method than the sword in dealing with those whom it suspected of plotting subversion and treason under the cloak of religion.

But why did the Roman sword fail? Dr. Grant thinks that the Roman government could have offered in the year 111 the edict of toleration which it finally had to give two centuries later, and that there need not have been any martyrs, "except for those Christians whose Christianity was a cloak for subversion. It can be argued that by attacking Christians the Roman empire deprived itself of the services of just those men whom it needed most" (p. 139). On the other hand, the arguments which the Christians used in claiming religious freedom for themselves became the weapons by which they promoted their own triumph; so that, when their situation was reversed, they in their turn could not abstain from oppression.

"The reason they did not abstain was that the state had failed in its duty to provide authority with freedom and to become a secular agency. The Roman principle that there should be a state religion was responsible for the difficulties of Christians and non-Christians alike. But the state, for its own good, should have refrained from entering into religious conflicts and should

have maintained absolute indifference to religious questions. The only duty of the state was to preserve freedom under law, and in performing this duty it failed. It attacked Christianity as subversion and later attacked pagan religion as superstition. Neither of these attacks performed any useful service. Each provided an instance of the state's usurpation of the place of God, to whom alone belonged the judgment of the various religions of the empire" (p. 140).

But this conclusion raises a question. Whether or not the state should have refrained, the fact is that it did not, because, in the nature of the case, it could not. The root of the difficulty is discussed by Chester G. Starr in his book, *Civilization and the Caesars: The Intellectual Revolution in the Roman Empire* (Cornell University Press, 1954). Sub-Christian as the writer of the Apocalypse was with respect to his attitude toward the persecutors of the Christians, he was nevertheless dealing with an issue that could not be compromised. This issue goes deeper than what shall be the relation between the church and the state. Caesar can never be granted the final say in determining what is the will of God. On the other hand the issue can not be settled merely by the state's resolve not to interfere with religion in any way, even after it has given up its pretensions to being God. For the tragic fact is that religious people suffering from an unenlightened conscience sometimes mistake the voice of God, and are unable to resist the temptation to become as immoral as Abraham would have been if he had slain his son Isaac as a human sacrifice to his God.

RAYMOND T. STAMM

Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts and Other Papers. By Burton Scott Easton; edited by Frederick C. Grant. Greenwich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1954. 158 pages. $3.50.

The main part of this volume is a reprint of Dr. Easton's brief, but important work on *The Purpose of Acts,* which had been out of print for a number of years. In addition, Dr. J. Howard W. Rhys has provided synopses of two of Dr. Easton's articles which were published originally in *The Anglican Theological Review,* "The Church in the New Testament" (Vol. XXII, 1940), and "Jewish and Early Christian Ordination" (Vol. V, 1922-23; VI, 1923-24). The last chapter, which is probably the last essay Dr. Easton wrote, is also a reprint from *The Anglican Theological Review* (Vol. XXXV, 1953); it is entitled, "Authority and Liberty in the New Testament." The editor, Dr. Grant, has written an inspiring sketch of the life and work of his teacher and collaborator.

In reading this biography, one is impressed with the range of Dr. Easton's learning and achievements. "No student," says Dr. Grant, "ever came under his influence without his mind being alerted, his heart quickened, his whole outlook on life enriched." Such a tribute does not come without price, and for Dr. Easton the price was long years of rigorous scholarly discipline. His earliest training was in science, and his dissertation for his doctorate in philosophy was in mathematics. But his transfer from the field of higher mathematics and astronomy to that of theology was a natural one. "Dr. Easton had always been a Christian and a churchman, and his interest in the New Testament was lifelong. It was fortunate for the Church that he recognized at so early a date where his major interest lay; it was fortunate for his own theological thinking and scriptural exegesis that he received so early a training in pure mathematics. The utter clarity of his thought, the conciseness and compactness of its expression, the unhesitating, even eager, approach to fresh problems, the refusal to guess at answers, the frank willingness to recognize some problems as insoluble for lack of evidence or in the absence of certain of their essential factors—all this was quite probably to some extent a consequence of his early years devoted to the study and teaching of mathematics."

Evidence of this influence appears in Dr. Easton's last essay, which exposes the fallacy "in the fundamental axiom of traditional thinking that a formulated theology lies behind the New Testament writings, or, in fact, a theology of any kind, formulated or unformulated." Pointing out that the whole concept of theology "is a Greek, not

a Hebrew, creation," he rejects the method of the systematizers, which misses the rich variety of New Testament conceptions and tries to make all the New Testament writers say the same thing. "No system of theology that pleads for complete uniformity of Christian thinking can claim to be the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints, the words which have been spoken aforetime by the apostles." His test for the validity of any theology is the test of time which Paul proposes in I Cor. 3:10-15. Judged by this test, Dr. Easton's own contributions to New Testament interpretation will be found to have, after all these years, much that is of "gold, silver, and precious stones."

RAYMOND T. STAMM

Handbook I Svensk Kyrokohistoria, II, III. By Hjalmar Holmquist. Stockholm, 1953, 1952. 269, 323 pages. Kr. 16, 20.

Hjalmar Holmquist, the celebrated professor of church history at Lund University, has left behind him a series of literary monuments to mark his mastery of his field. He was one of the promoters of a remarkable set of volumes covering the history of the Church of Sweden, which is still incomplete but has given that Church a history in modern form almost unique. For students he provided a survey of the history of the Christian Church in three compact volumes. He also prepared a survey of the history of the Swedish Church, Yngve Brilioth writing the first part on the medieval period, and himself telling the story from the Reformation to the First World War, in two parts.

It is this latter work that has now appeared in a second edition, with some editorial changes. Part II of the edition appeared in 1953, Part III was ready a year earlier. Part II is a survey of the Swedish Church from 1521 to 1809. Part III gives an account of the century 1809-1914, and adds brief reviews of the history of the Church in Denmark, Norway, and Finland, together with an index of all three parts.

These pages are full of material. Holmquist used much of it in his lectures, so that the style is direct, factual, comprehensive. But this does not imply that it is dry or hard reading. As teacher and writer Holmquist had the gift of clarity. Though names swarm over the pages, they are related to a theme and the text is conveniently divided and given helpful titles. In the main the outline follows the reigns of the kings, though the third volume tends to fall into decades. The history of the Church is set into the context of the political, literary, and cultural life of each period.

This would be an excellent work to translate, to give the English reader a substantial picture of the Lutheran Church of the North. Lutheranism is too often judged by its experience in Germany. The Swedish Church developed altogether differently than the churches in the territorial areas of Germany. It safeguarded its independence in a succession of strong bishops, and, since 1868, in a Church Convocation, and produced quite a different outlook than that of the consistories of Germany. Even in the 19th century the Church of Sweden met its problems differently than the German churches. It is regrettable that the various areas of the Lutheran Church—German, Scandinavian, American—know so little of each other and that each thinks itself capable of representing the whole church. Catholicity in Lutheranism probably will have to come before we can attain catholicity in either Protestantism or Christendom. A first step in the American scene is to have such textbooks as this available for the Lutheran who reads only one language.

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

Lutheran Cyclopedia. Edited by Erwin L. Lueker. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1954. 1,160 pages. $7.50.

This is an excellent one-volume reference work. It is comprehensive without being bulky. The jacket announces that it contains the work of 112 contributors covering 7,550 subjects. As an encyclopedic work it provides in summary form the essential information on each subject. There are numerous and convenient cross-references.

In reality this volume is a revision and enlargement of the *Concordia Cyclopedia* published in 1927. It surpasses the earlier

volume by including more topics, enlarging some articles, presenting other items in better form, and in bringing the data down to date. An additional feature is that bibliographies are provided either for articles repeated from the *Concordia Cyclopedia* or for new articles. A considerable part of the earlier volume has been carried over in toto.

According to the "Editor's Preface" this work covers the areas of Bible interpretation, systematic theology, church history, and life and worship in the church. A sentence from the Preface of the earlier work applies here also; it is a "comprehensive work of general religious information with special reference to the history, doctrine, work and usages of the Lutheran Church." The name of the book is therefore quite appropriate. It will find its special usefulness among Lutherans. Moreover, it "was written under the auspices of the General Literature Board of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod."

Yet it is not narrowly Missourian, as is evidenced by the fact that many contributors are from other Lutheran bodies, e.g., T. G. Tappert, Conrad Bergendoff, Harold L. Yochum, and Herman A. Preus.

As a sample of the book's comprehensiveness this reviewer followed his special interest in the history of Lutherans in America. The topics covered in this area are quite extensive, so that the *Cyclopedia* is a very valuable aid to students in Lutheran history in our country. There are articles on the general Lutheran bodies, the synods, the leading personalities, important events, and the various sets of theses or articles forming the basis of union or federation.

Of particular value in this connection are the biographical sketches. A check of a list of leading Lutherans in America indicates a rather thorough coverage. This reviewer wishes there had been included the names of John O. Evjen, Paul E. Kretzmann (one of the editors of the *Concordia Cyclopedia*), and Lauritz Larsen of the National Lutheran Council. Usually the first names of the persons are given, but at times only initials, e.g., G(eorge) M(artin) Grossman, and J(ohn) M(ichael) Reu. In the case of C. H. L. Schuette, the date of his death is given in the *Lutheran World Almanac,* vol. V, as 1926, not 1924. Of Americans in world Lutheranism there is listed John A. Morehead and Ralph H. Long, but not S. C. Michelfelder.

The article on "Finnish Lutherans in America" might have begun with a notice of Finns in the colonial settlements. And there is a question as to whether the name of the first pastor was Beckman or Backman.

Generally the selection of persons is made of those no longer living. But there are articles on Barth, Brunner, Bultmann, and Schweitzer. Of American liberals S. Parkes Cadman (died 1936) is included, but not H. E. Fosdick. There is a mistake in the instance of Bilney, the English Protestant martyr: his first name was Thomas, not Theodore.

In the area of the history of missions there are, of course, listed Xavier and Schwartz and even Ricci; but there might have been included an article on the Malabar rites. And also one on John R. Mott would be desired. Of the missionaries in Latin America attention is given to Las Casas (listed as "Casas") but not St. Toribio or St. Peter Claver.

Because American works tend to neglect the Eastern Orthodox churches a sampling was made on this subject. There is an article of considerable length (considering the limitations of this volume) on "Eastern Orthodox Churches" and on "Eastern Orthodox Confessions." Concerning the modern Russian Orthodox sects there is an article on the Doukhobors, but not the Raskolniki, or any others.

The Preface notes that Frederick E. Mayer was an editorial adviser in the area of religious bodies in America. We remember his recent volume in this field. The condensations of his material in articles in the *Cyclopedia* are very useful for quick reference.

As a matter of general interest, there is no article on the Anti-Saloon League or of Wayne B. Wheeler or of Prohibition, but only on "Temperance Movements in the Lutheran Church."

The articles are as accurate as proofreaders and authors depending on secondary sources can make them. Errors are rare.

As a sample this reviewer selected the article on "Ohio and Other States, Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of," for close examination. This article is almost identical with that in the *Concordia Cyclopedia,* being only slightly rewritten and enlarged. The original author depended apparently on secondary sources, facing the difficulty that there is no really satisfactory treatment of Lutherans in Ohio. Corrections need to be made as follows: Ohio entered the Union in 1803; at the 1812 Conference G. H. Weygandt was a member and the pastor loci, not a guest; the Synod organized in 1818 without the permission of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania which had granted only the right of licensure; the minutes of 1818 list as present four pastors, six licensed candidates, and seven who were absent, besides two others licensed as catechists at that meeting; the first English District which seceded joined the General Synod in 1843. These are very minor matters in an otherwise satisfactory article. Similarly in the article on Matthias Loy, the fact seems to be that he was licensed by the Western District of the Joint Synod of Ohio in 1849 and ordained by that District June 6, 1852.

In general the treatment is factual, objective and fair. Of necessity the articles are brief. Only very rarely does there appear any coloring or adjective that involves a judgment. Remembering the feeling connected with the word "unionistic" it is interesting to note that it occurs in the article on the Basel Missionary Society (repeated from *Concordia Cyclopedia*) and in the article on Buchmanism. Incidentally, there are articles on Lodges, Fraternities, Freemasonry, Elks, and Odd Fellows.

For the purpose of this review the volume was examined critically. However, this reviewer is enthusiastic about the book. It is decidedly superior to the *Concordia Cyclopedia* in paper and print. It is attractively bound and is priced quite reasonably. It is to be recommended as a volume convenient in size, comprehensive in scope, concise in treatment, and equitable in its judgments.

W. D. Allbeck

Christian Theology: An Ecumenical Approach. By Walter Marshall Horton. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955. 304 pages. $3.75.

Walter Marshall Horton has written a fine book. Professor of Theology at Oberlin and for more than twenty years active participant in things ecumenical, Dr. Horton reflects both strands of his life in this book. Perhaps no one could have written it better.

The book has a definite framework. Each of its eight chapters concerns itself with a facet of theology; for example, "The Knowledge of God," "Christ the Saviour," "The Church and the Means of Grace," and "The Christian Hope." Further, each chapter has a framework. Each (except the first) is threefold. First is posited the universal need to which that facet of Christian doctrine provides the answer. For example, under "Christ the Saviour" comes "The Universal Problem of Mediation." Part two is then Horton's exposition of the Christian consensus concerning the Christian answer. And part three is always titled "Unresolved Issues" concerning the same doctrinal answer. It is a helpful and, I think, coherent framework.

Professor Horton states that he means this volume to be a textbook in Systematic Theology. It should serve that purpose well. For it is informed, balanced, clear, and, above all, fair. The only bias is a bias of zeal, of zeal on behalf of ecumenicity, so that this reader frequently wondered if the wish were not father to the thought, if the consensus was as uniform and extensive, if the unresolved issues were as sure of resolution as Horton indicates. In short, it is an irenic book, perhaps too irenic.

But it is far more than a textbook. Because it is so clear, because it is so well-written, because it is never for a moment pedantic or dull, because it is about great themes, and great accomplishments, and great hopes, it is also a book for all pastors and many laymen.

The reviewer liked three things especially. First is the stimulating relation of a human problem to the Christian answer. If your doctrine has tended not to have its feet on the ground, if your words have not been

engaging human needs and aspirations, hopes and fears, this book will challenge and stimulate you. Second is the reference value of the book. Frequently quoted are key statements and passages from the various ecumenical gatherings; from Oxford and Edinburgh, from Jerusalem and Madras, from Amsterdam and all the rest. This alone is of value. Third is the understanding, helpful summary of many of the great books and theologians of our time. Although I did not count, I suspect Aulen is most often mentioned, unless it is Tillich. Others are Brunner, Barth, DeWolfe, Niebuhr, and William Adams Brown.

Professor Horton occupies a thoroughly mediating position throughout the book. Always he combines an appreciation of the liberal with an understanding of the conservative and orthodox. Obviously, in a work designed to be as comprehensive as this, any particular point of view could establish the fact that its own insights and emphases had not been adequately dealt with, but that, I think, would be unfair carping. This book succeeds in being what its title says it is, and succeeds in being it most gloriously well.

JOHN H. SARDESON

Bibelns Auktoritet. By Ruben Josefson. Stockholm, 1953. 258 pages.

The title of this book might very well have been, "The Authority of the Bible according to Luther and the Confessions." The statement of the confessions about the authority of the Bible is unequivocal. The Formula of Concord makes a clear distinction between "The prophetic and apostolic scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments" and all other ancient and recent writings. The Bible is rule and norm for faith and life, all other writings are witnesses to the truth. The confessions are testimonies to and explanations of the faith; they are expositions and interpretations of scripture. The church traditions are important, but the Scriptures are above the tradition.

Dr. Josefson's contention is that the confessions are interpretations of Scripture; and more specifically, that it is Luther's interpretation which the confessions endeavor to safeguard. They do not assume to be *norma normans.* That distinction belongs solely to the Scriptures. But they also claim to be correct interpretations of Scripture and of the scriptural way of salvation. Scripture is both source and norm for the proclamation of the gospel in and by the church, and the confessions are a guide to the church in this proclamation.

After having established the fundamental conception of the authority of Scripture in the confessions, Josefson proceeds to examine its implications. The sections of the book are: Message and Doctrine; the Bible as Ethical Norm; and Biblical Faith and Historical Criticism. Most of this discussion takes into account certain contemporary interpretations by scholars in Scandinavia and on the continent. He examines critically the dualistic-dramatic conception represented by Aulen, Nygren, Bring and Wingren, and comes to the conclusion that this fails to find an adequate place for the idea of forgiveness (p. 67). Although Luther (and the confessions) use the idea of struggle and victory to interpret the work of Christ, Josefson insists that there are other ideas, such as the suffering the penalty for sin, which also have a place in Luther's theology. In the section on the ethical life he discusses the doctrine of "the Christian calling," "The third use of the law" and "law and gospel."

It is difficult to give an adequate idea of the scope of the book in a brief space, but what has been said indicates that the author does not follow a line of reasoning which we might expect from the title "The Authority of the Bible." He does not discuss inspiration, historical accuracy, or the authenticity of the documents. The authority of the Bible is an authority for faith, the authority of a proclamation which includes judgment and grace, law and gospel. It is an authority which resides in the event and the word, a personal authority which the believer accepts without external pressure. This authority is not a subject which can be discussed by itself; it has to be placed in the context of the whole biblical revelation which discloses what man's relationship to God is and must be.

One question must be raised. If the Bible,

as Josefson declares, contains both an account of the events and the interpretation of the events, then what is the difference between the interpretation contained in the Bible and the interpretation contained in the confessions? Why is the former *norma normans* and the latter *norma normata?* Paul is a witness to the event of Christ, but he also interprets the meaning of this event. Why is his interpretation normative for all subsequent interpretation? This question must obviously be answered before we can establish fully "The authority of the Bible."

E. H. WAHLSTROM

Gehorsam gegen Gott und Menschen. Luthers Lehre von der Obrigkeit und die moderne evangelische Staatsethik. By Gunnar Hillerdal. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1954. 320 pages.

The present volume is a valuable addition to the large and still growing body of recent investigations and re-evaluations of Luther's teaching concerning the State. It is a dissertation written at the University of Lund under the direction of Gustaf Wingren and Ragnar Bring. Thus it reflects to some degree the current Lund theology.

The first part of the book, an investigation of Luther's *Staatsethik*, is excellent. The second part is rather limited, but it discusses at length the theology of six modern representative scholars, three Lutheran and three Reformed. The choice of the author falls upon the Lutherans Elert, Althaus, and Gogarten, and upon the Reformed Barth, de Quervain, and Ellul. Important theologians like Berggrav, Asmussen, Bornkamm, Dibelius, Dehn, Kittel, v. Campenhausen, and especially Kuenneth, are either left out completely, or treated very briefly and incompletely, or relegated to footnotes. The most comprehensive and probably the best modern *Staatsethik* by a Lutheran, Kuenneth's *Politik zwischen Dämon und Gott*, rates merely a few brief footnotes. Thus the subtitle "Luther's teaching concerning government and the modern evangelical *Staatsethik*" is a misnomer.

It is also to be questioned whether all six theologians chosen by the author are representative of a large segment of modern theology. Certainly Jacques Ellul's book "Le Fondement théologique du Droit" is more the work of a legal mind, than that of an exegete. Alfred de Quervain does not represent a large segment of Reformed theology. There remains only Karl Barth, and his *Staatsethik* is so confused (and confusing) as to be almost embarrassing.

The strength of the book rests, first, on the enlightening discussion of Luther's doctrine of the State, which was not one doctrine, but several. The author is refreshingly critical. He presents the well-known statements of Luther on the subject. He points out contradictions in the Reformer's theology. While the young Luther is a daring, almost revolutionary advocate of social reforms, the older Luther is extremely careful in his utterances. The great change came during the peasant war of 1525. On the other hand Luther later actively sponsors the league of Protestant princes which is being formed for the sole purpose of forcing the emperor's hand. Equally does Luther change in his teaching concerning the rights of temporal authorities. In 1525 he proclaims that *"obirkeit soll nicht weren, was yederman leren und gleuben will, es sey Euangelion odder lügen."* But ten years later he advises the government that it is in duty bound to "punish false teachings and heresies."

Still, on the whole, Luther's theology was quite fixed. Romans 13 and I Peter 2, 13 together with Matthew 5-7 are *Gottes zeugnis von jm selbs* in regards to the Christian and the State. God alone is the *causa efficiens* and the *causa finalis* of all power on earth. No one dare interfere. Or?

Here Hillerdal calls attention to a strange twist in Luther's theology. Yes, there are exceptions. God has his *Wunderleute* whom he calls to set aside the law of the land when there is a need to do so. Hillerdal deserves credit for having called attention to this strange "way out" in Luther's theology. He discusses the *Wunderleute* at length. Luther's *Staatsethik* is by no means as simple as many interpreters of the great Reformer have claimed.

The second strong point in favor of this

book is that the author investigates thoroughly the claims of the six modern theologians, and for the most part finds them wanting. He is kindest, of course, to the three Lutherans, but even here he finds many weaknesses. He does not recognize the distinction of "ethos under the law" and "objective ethos" as taught by Elert. Althaus' doctrine of the state as "creative order" is discussed in detail, as is Gogarten's "political ethics." Gogarten apparently is the weakest of the three.

Thirdly, the author shows clearly the gulf that is fixed between modern Reformed theology and Evangelical theology which accepts Luther's dictum *scriptura sua interpres.* While Elert and Althaus may believe that Paul wrote Romans 13 to counteract the rebellion caused by certain Jewish zealots, the Reformed theologians go out on a limb: Was Romans written under a benevolent Nero, disciple of the virtuous Seneca? Was Paul hailing Nero as a perfect ruler? Or does, perhaps, Romans 13 not apply to governmental powers at all? Is the "higher power" the power of the angels? Apparently anything goes to do away with the offense of Romans 13.

Hillerdal tries to present both sides in a fair way. One has, however, the impression after reading the book that Luther was by far the greatest theologian of all, and that a certain Swiss theologian is not the mental giant which his followers proclaim, at least not in *Staatsethik.* One also comes away from this book knowing that the theologians are hopelessly confused on the burning problem of our times, the Christian and the State.

WALTER G. TILLMANNS

Faith and Moral Authority. By Benj. F. Kimpel. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. 186 pages. $2.75.

Can ethics be saved by denying that there are *general* moral principles? Dr. Kimpel's answer is an emphatic no. "The point of view basic to this essay . . . is that an individual cannot achieve a morally ordered life without some directives learned from others any more than he can achieve a significant science if he were to dispense with all instruction from others. . . . The widespread disorder in modern life is the attempt to create a corporate order with individuals whose lives are not ordered by principles suitable to be directives in human relations" (3-5).

Chapter one is concerned with the nature of moral philosophy. The inadequacy of etymological analysis is noted. If customs were a sufficient criterion, there would be no basis for passing judgment approving some *mores* and condemning others—a practice in which even relativists engage. Moral philosophy must seek a practical principle for living which at the same time is not limited to practice, i.e., a generally applicable pattern of conduct. This principle must be something more than logical consistency, for in spite of Kant and other rationalists, men will consciously tolerate inconsistencies. Where is this criterion to be found?

Chapter two examines the relationship of moral philosophy to faith. The views of Socrates and the Sophists, the ancient relativists-existentialists, are contrasted. Socrates believed that moral knowledge is discoverable; the Sophists denied this; the latter were oblivious to the intellectual anarchy to which their position led.

The relationship between ethics and epistemology is expressed in chapter three. Particular attention is afforded the views of Jaspers and Marcel. Not only is a system of ethics formulated within the presuppositions of a theory of knowledge, but this theory determines the ethics in question. "What one believes about the nature of knowledge sets limits to what one also believes about the nature of moral principles" (71).

If one can know only the self and its experiences, how shall one escape solipsism? And how are solipsism and ethics compatible? The author's criticisms of the eclectics who quote at pleasure from the existentialists are obvious but worthy of note. "Where the creative activity in human life is regarded as most significant, the scope of moral philosophy is also confined to activity without reference to criteria for evaluating the activity" (87-88).

The relationship of faith and moral insight forms the subject-matter for chapter four. The despair characteristic of our tech-

nological age is noted. Man has become disillusioned about finding the good life through invention and would-be automatic progress. He finds the old absolutes untenable, so he yields to despair, ". . . in rejecting what turned out to be a deceptive way of life, many have come to the conclusion that there is no trustworthy way" (91).

This abandonment of faith in objective principles and the teachings of institutions turns the individual in upon himself. "The belief that there are no universally dependable directives for human life is the very premise of modern philosophies of existence. . . . According to the existentialists . . . whatever there is of moral significance which is to be acquired by an individual must first be created by him. . . . However, when the uniqueness of the individual is pressed to this point, the emphasis becomes a philosophical basis for an individualism which is anarchistic . . . it is anti-authority. It is a repudiation of the very basis for a social order, since a social order is possible only when there are *some* principles which individuals can respect for their directive function" (95).

Moral faith the author defines as the conviction that good which can come into being for the benefit of human life *ought* to come into being; to bring this about by all the resources at his disposal is the individual's responsibility. Moral insight is the specific way in which this is to be carried out. Are the principles intended to do this adequate? Are they rightly interpreted? Here lies the problem for the individual; in solving it he must have recourse to the experience of the past, to the institutionally endorsed directives. The thus attained moral insight becomes the moral authority, and reflections on these matters becomes moral philosophizing.

The final chapter discusses faith and moral decision. The former becomes the basis for the latter. Moral decision is *action*. It is ". . . acting upon a preference which an individual recognizes he ought to want. An individual's decision to conform to an authority which he believes to be worthy for his life constitutes the radical difference between morally earnest living and living which is not even within the category of morally earnest decision" (122).

Moral obligation implies also that of being intelligent. One must act on what one believes will benefit mankind, at the same time being as well-informed as one can be. Morbid introspection is not to be commended. The concern is with the benefit for others, not with the person's desire to seek the others' welfare.

What the author has to say about the development of moral character and the rejection of all forms of determinism is important, but needs no special comment. The same holds true of his characterizing of a concern with satisfactions as infantile.

Most significant is his final conclusion: that religious faith will provide the ultimate moral norm. "It affirms that there is a reality transcendent of human life which may be known; and when known will inform his life with a trustworthy norm" (149).

The author leaves us in the dark as to what is meant by human well-being. The work is no source of ready-made solutions, nor is its style likely to charm the reader. But in an age when many suppose that existentialism has saved faith by removing it from reason and experience, it is refreshing and reassuring to be reminded once again that general principles are necessary realities; that these demand religious faith rather than oppose or destroy it.

A. C. M. Ahlén

Politikk og Misjon. By Fridtjov Birkeli. Oslo: Egede-Instituttet, 1952. 484 pages. Kr. 22.20.

As a general rule Protestant missionaries try to avoid interference with the politics in the colonial areas where they serve. Their purpose is solely to bring the Gospel to unevangelized peoples.

In his admirable treatise, "Politikk og Misjon," Fridtjov Birkeli lays before us the pressing problem of the missionary and his attitude to the colonial government.

This study covers the years from 1861 to 1875, immediately following the Martyr period in Madagascar. This was the age of colonial expansion. Several missionary societies attempted to establish or reestablish

themselves on the Island. At the same time the governments of France and England vied for political control.

French and English missionaries were involved in the political ferment. The missionaries from France, largely Jesuits with their concept of the end justifying the means, used every method of intrigue to aid their nation to possess Madagascar, for this would give a free hand to the Roman Catholic Church. The English missionaries of the London Missionary Society, with leanings towards Calvin's teaching on Church and State, believed that English state supremacy would give them control.

There were also confessional differences between Protestant missions of the same homeland. The London Missionary Society and the Anglican State Church carried their controversy to Madagascar. In like manner the missionaries from Norway were bound to differ in foreign mission policy, since there were both the high church attitude of Bishop H. P. S. Schreuder and the more liberal attitude of Lars Dahle, for many years superintendent and general secretary of the Norwegian mission.

With impressive skill Birkeli traces these developments and shows that a missionary cannot entirely separate himself from the affairs of the state. He is a part of the political situation whether he wishes to be or not, even though every attempt is made to prevent the church from being used for political ends. However, concludes Birkeli, "Christian missions ought to be as much denationalized and depoliticized as possible in order to protect their spiritual integrity. But to draw the limit between the correct and incorrect political behavior of the missionaries has proved quite difficult. It depends upon the ultimate political and missionary aims." Birkeli discovers that when the Protestant missions were free from political interests they could prepare for a more super-national and inter-confessional mission. The Norwegian mission in Madagascar is a striking example of this.

In this study the author demonstrates that the problem of "politics-missions" comes to the fore as one of the most significant in current missionary research; that research in the history of missions in colonial areas should be re-orientated to political history; and that the establishment of the Norwegian Missions is a part of a larger international setting.

This vital and outstanding contribution to missions is the fruit of many years of painstaking and extensive research in the files of the colonial offices and numerous mission societies in France, England, Sweden, and Denmark.

The author was a missionary in Madagascar and is a son of the mission historian and scholar, the late missionary to Madagascar, Dr. Emil Birkeli. He is one of the authors of the monumental work of five volumes covering the history of the Norwegian Missionary Society, the former editor of Norsk Misjonstidende and educational secretary of the Norwegian Missionary Society, and is the present director of the Department of World Missions of the Lutheran World Federation with headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland.

"Politikk og Misjon" is the fourth in the growing list of studies on foreign missions sponsored by the Egede Institute of Norway.

A. S. Burgess

The Study of Missions in Theological Education. Volume I: to 1910. By Olav Guttorm Myklebust. Oslo: Forlaget Land og Kirke, 1955. Published for the Egede Institute. Paper, 459 pages. Kr. 27.80.

The author intends to have the present volume followed by a second, which is to treat the place which the study of missions occupied in theological education in the period since 1910. By the "study of missions" he means to include both the history and the theory of the foreign missionary enterprise insofar as these have had a place in the training of Protestant ministers in the Western world.

After a brief chapter on the neglect of such study in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, the greater part of the present volume is devoted to the nineteenth century, and especially to the latter half of this century. Schleiermacher gave some attention to missions in the theological curriculum, but the outstanding pioneers of

missionary education were Alexander Duff in Scotland and Gustav Warneck in Germany. The former became the first occupant of a chair of missions (professorship of Evangelistic Theology in New College, Edinburgh) in 1867, but the experiment had limited success and was abolished after Duff's death in 1878. In the same year in which the chair of missions was established in Scotland a proposal was made to establish a similar chair in Berlin. It was not until 1897, however, that Warneck entered upon his professorship in Halle. Before this he had prepared the way by extensive scholarly studies, and he became "the real founder of the science of missions." He contended very properly (and this advice has often been disregarded since) that the introduction of a new subject in the theological curriculum requires long and careful preparation. The fact that Warneck devoted many years of preparation to the launching of his subject helps to account for the comparatively greater success which he enjoyed.

Although the work of Duff and Warneck are its highlights, this book offers a chronological-geographical survey of the manifold contributions to missionary education in literature, lectures, and foundations to the year 1910. Besides Scotland and Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands, Switzerland, England, and America receive their share of attention.

The study by Myklebust is important not only because it breaks fresh ground but also because it helps to throw light on many of the thorny problems which are involved in the construction of curricula for the training of ministers. Naturally, the study is also of primary significance for the study of missions itself.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

Religious Trends in Modern China. By Wing-tsit Chan. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953.

Dr. Chan is professor of Chinese culture and philosophy at Dartmouth College, and the content of this book was delivered as the Haskell Lectures in the University of Chicago, 1950. The religious trends which Dr. Chan discusses deal with Confucianism, Buddhism, the Religion of the Masses, Islam, and the Religion of the Intellectual.

In the tremendous changes which have occurred in China during the last fifty years, Chinese religions have played a relatively insignificant part. The religious rites and ceremonies of the people have remained unchanged, although in many places temples have been closed and images destroyed. Atheism and agnosticism have replaced faith in a large section of the population. The old practices persist, but they are being changed and developed under the impact of new conditions.

During the first part of this century there was a determined effort, both under the Manchus and under the republic, to establish Confucianism as the state religion of China. The attempt failed, and many of the intellectuals began to oppose Confucianism both as a religion and a cultural force. Confucianism, they claimed, is not suited to modern life. Between these extremes a number of serious scholars have worked to reinterpret Confucius and have developed a Neo-Confucianism which tries to preserve the essential teachings of the Great Sage. Even Mao Tse-tung "advises his party members to learn from Confucius and Sun Yet-sen as well as from Marx and Lenin."

Chinese Buddhism, under the impact of Christianity and the attempt to make Confucianism a state religion, has developed a greater self-consciousness and has inaugurated several reform movements. It has developed a mystical trend, an emphasis on faith and life, participation of the laity in religious exercises, and an interest in the life here and now. Since one of its essential principles is aloofness from all government, it may be able to survive even under the present regime.

The religion of the masses is a syncretism of all the religions of China, consisting in the worship of various gods of different origin and concerned with the daily life of the people. Dr. Chan notes the development of religious societies, an emphasis on this-worldliness and on ethics, and a tendency toward syncretism. Lately Islam has come out of its isolation, and within that religion, too, new trends can be noted.

This book is intensely interesting, well documented from Chinese and English sources, and very informative. It dispels the old notion that Chinese society and thinking are static and unchanging. Chinese philosophy and the study and interpretation of history are very much alive and are pursued with vigor by a large company of Chinese scholars. Chinese religion, too, is very much alive, and many forces are at work to destroy and to renew the foundations of Chinese life and culture. Any missionary who intends to approach the Chinese people, either the masses or the intellectuals, would do well to acquaint himself with "the Religious Trends in Modern China."

E. H. WAHLSTROM

Customs and Cultures. By Eugene A. Nida. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. 306 pages. $4.

Dr. Nida writes well. The sub-title of this book, Anthropology for Christian Missions, indicates the definite category to which the book belongs. A new book by Dr. Nida in this field is always welcome. The author takes the reader on a sort of "magic carpet" flight from country to country, roaming over a large field of customs and cultures, and introducing the readers to some almost unbelievable situations and customs. A missionary especially needs to study this book, but pastors, members of boards of missions, Sunday School teachers and other workers in the church will find much material of interest and help in their work. One does not need to be in complete agreement with the author in all his conclusions in order to enjoy the book and to profit by it. The field of anthropology on the mission fields needs competent and sympathetic study. Some work has been done in this field, but much remains to be done. The chapter headings tell a good deal about the content:

1. Shocks and Surprises; 2. Rhyme and Reason; 3. Race and Ranting; 4. Hoes and Headaches; 5. Friends and Frustrations; 6. Devils and Doubts; 7. Drums and Drama; 8. Queer Sounds, Strange Grammar, and Unexpected Meanings; 9. Old Customs and New Ways; 10. New Solutions to Old Problems.

In the Appendix the author gives some practical suggestions as to the ways in which missionaries may acquire helpful anthropological background and field data. There is a valuable bibliography of four pages, and nineteen pages of explanatory notes.

One might wish that the author had given more time to certain areas, but the rapid flight from place to place keeps the interest up, and the book is definitely to be recommended as a valuable contribution to the field of anthropology.

JOHN E. GRONLI

Meditation and Piety in the Far East. By Karl Ludwig Reichelt. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. 171 pages. $3.

Dr. Reichelt was no doubt the greatest non-Buddhist authority on Buddhism of our time. Having served as missionary in the service of the Norwegian Missionary Society in Hunan, China, for nine years, and as Professor at Central China Union Lutheran Seminary at Shekow, Hupeh, for nine years, he founded the Christian Mission to Buddhists in 1922. The center of this mission was first at Ching Feng Shan near Nanking, and was later moved to Tao Feng Shan in South China. Dr. Reichelt passed away in 1952.

Among the many books from Dr. Reichelt's pen is a set of three volumes on the subject of the title of this book, which is the first volume of the set. The translation from the Norwegian by Dr. Sverre Holt is excellent. Dr. Holt has himself worked as missionary in inland China, and is now stationed at Singapore.

The book is divided into two main parts: (1) Introductory, and (2) Meditation, the Heartbeat of the East-Asian Religions. To come into close contact with the religious stirring in East and Southeast Asia, to look into that strange landscape and to sense the tremendous forces at work there, is an experience never to be forgotten. A great many books have been written lately dealing in general with this theme, but this reviewer knows of no book that in 171 pages gives the reader such intimate glimpses into that strange and significant situation as does this

book by Dr. Reichelt. The search for God, the seeking if haply they might feel after him and find him, is seen in various phases of Eastern religions—in Bhaktism, in the worship of Amitabha, in the pilgrimages and sacrifices, a search, yes, but which often leads into the jungle of a mysticism which centers in posture, breathing exercises, and self-elevation. But here and there the meditation "breaks through." There is a rich field of religious experience to be studied in the meditation of the sages of the East, ancient and modern. What really was the experience of Prince Sidhara of the Sakya people when under the bodhi tree he received the illumination which made him the Buddha, the Enlightened One? What did Lao-tzu, Chuang-tzu and other sages in ancient China mean by *Tao?* Did they sense the Eternal, and were they in touch with the Infinite? Dr. Reichelt tries to answer this question.

Especially valuable is the chapter on Mohism, or the teachings of Mo-ti, little known in the West. Mo-ti's *chien-ai* or reciprocal love comes close to the Christian idea of love.

Dr. Reichelt's book is timely. Eastern and Southeastern Asia loom large today in importance. It is necessary for a true understanding of that part of the world to know the thinking of the people who inhabit those lands, and especially is this true in the field of religion. This book is a valuable help in that direction, and is highly recommended.

JOHN E. GRONLI

The Christian Imprint. By Fred P. Corson. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1955. 156 pages, $2.50.

Bishop Corson is for Christian education—more and better Christian education. His book is meant to stimulate others to see its importance and give themselves to it vigorously for adequate results.

The contents of these chapters were the Quillian Lectures at Emory University. They have the flavor of public speech that is meant to get and hold attention with striking figure, apt turn of phrase and urgent data: ". . . the Christian educator must do most of his teaching in the laboratory of life and in the field trips of past history and current observation . . ."; ". . . one consistently good life can silence the doubts of an inquiring age in revolt against tradition." Biblical references are not infrequent.

The idea of "the Christian imprint" is that youth (the author is thinking about this group) shall bear the impress of Christ as on a page or coin. It is his way of describing figuratively what is elsewhere characterized as "creating better people who in turn will make a better world." A pastor can profit from reading this kind of volume occasionally to keep his own spirit keen (and his reservoir filled). He could profitably, also, let it circulate among his congregational leaders. All in all, it is not a book on the technical "how"; rather, on the stirring "why."

RALPH D. HEIM

America's Lutherans. Edited by Omar Bonderud and Charles Lutz. Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1955. Paper, 63 pages. 50 cents.

Originally prepared for young people as a series of articles on the major Lutheran bodies in North America, the sixteen chapters in this booklet (most of them by members of the bodies described) offer an instructive introduction to Lutheran unity and diversity. Some minor shortcomings (for example, there is a chapter on the Slovak Evangelical Lutheran Church but no mention of the Slovak Zion Synod, of comparable size, within the United Lutheran Church) do not militate seriously against the usefulness of the booklet as a basis for group discussions. Graphs and pictures add to its value for this purpose.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY